REPORT RESUMES

ED 012 459

AL 000 569

SELECTED CONFERENCE PAPERS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE.

BY- KAPLAN, ROBERT B. AND OTHERS

NATIONAL ASSN. FOR FOREIGN STUDENT AFFAIRS

REPORT NUMBER NAFSA-ENGL-LANG-SER-12 PUB DATE DEC 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.44 111P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ENGLISH (SECOND LANGUAGE), *LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, *CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, *TEACHER EDUCATION, SOCIOLINGUISTICS, PSYCHOLINGUISTICS, TRANSFORMATION THEORY (LANGUAGE), PRONUNCIATION, WRITING SKILLS, READING SKILLS, ADJUSTMENT PROBLEMS, CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS, SCHOOL SYSTEMS, *CONFERENCE REPORTS, ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, CHICAGO

THESE PAPERS WERE PRESENTED AT THE 1966 ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR FOREIGN STUDENT AFFAIRS IN CHICAGO AT SECTION MEETINGS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE. SUBJECTS (AND AUTHORS) OF PAPERS PRESENTED ARE AS FOLLOWS--CURRICULUM PATTERNS (M. FINNOCHIARO), TEACHER PREPARATION (S. OHANNESSIAN), ASIAN AND AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS (W.B. VAN SYOC), TRANSFORMATIONAL THEORY AND CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS (P. SCHACTER), CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH AND TAGALOG (R.D. WILSON), TRANSFORMATIONAL ANALYSIS (L. MCINTOSH), SOCIOLINGUISTICS (C.A. FERGUSON), SOCIOLINGUISTICS (J.C. CATFORD), SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING (J.B. CARROLL), PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENTS (R.C. GARDNER), PLANNING GUIDELINES (C.H. PRATOR), TESTS (L.A. PALMER), LISTENING AND READING (V.F. ALLEN), PRONUNCIATION (E. ENATA), COMPOSITION (W.R. SLAGER), AND READING AND WRITING (R.B. KAPLAN). THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PRESS, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, FOR $1.75. (AMM)

NAFSA Studies and Papers
English Language Series
Number 12

ED012459

SELECTED CONFERENCE PAPERS
of
THE ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

(A Section of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs)

1966

ROBERT B. KAPLAN
Editor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Published by

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR FOREIGN STUDENT AFFAIRS

December 1966

The University of Southern California Press

AL 000 569

[illegible]

Price $1.75

NAFSA Studies and Papers
English Language Series
Number 12

SELECTED CONFERENCE PAPERS

of

THE ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

(A Section of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs)

1966

Robert B. Kaplan
Editor

Published by
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR FOREIGN STUDENT AFFAIRS

December, 1966

The University of Southern California Press

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS [redacted] MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY the national Asso. for Foreign Student Affairs TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE [redacted] OWNER."

PREFACE

These papers were presented at the 1966 annual conference of The National Association for Foreign Student Affairs in Chicago at section meetings of the Association of Teachers of English as a Second Language. The title Selected Conference Papers rather than simply Conference Papers only indicates that manuscript copies of all of the papers presented at the conference were not available.

Relatively little has been done to the papers editorially. Some adjustments in punctuation were made, and typographical errors were corrected. In a very few cases, minor changes were made so that the papers would conform with the format of the whole. The papers are arranged in the order in which they were presented at the conference. This order seemed most logical, since groups of the papers do constitute units of related information.

Contrary to the procedure initiated by Professor Croft, editor of last year's Conference Papers, a bibliography is not appended. Instead, the annual ATESL bibliography will be published under separate cover and will be available to members in the same way as the Conference Papers.

The Editor wishes to express his gratitude for the promptness with which the papers were submitted for publication and for the pains that the authors took to prepare their papers. He is particularly grateful to Professor Aston, Conference Chairman, for all her help.

In accord with the tone of the meeting, these Selected Conference Papers are respectfully dedicated to Professor Charles C. Fries. The Editor did not have the privilege of working with Professor Fries, but he is cognizant of the enormous significance of the work done by Professor Fries. Accordingly, the Tribute read at the annual luncheon by Professor Lado is included as the first paper in this volume.

University of Southern California
December, 1966

Robert B. Kaplan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Robert Lado: A TRIBUTE TO CHARLES C. FRIES. v

Mary Finocchiaro: CURRICULAR PATTERNS AND THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE 1

Serarpi Ohannessian: PATTERNS OF TEACHERS PREPARATION IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES 8

W. Bryce Van Syoc: SOME REPRESENTATIVE PATTERNS OF ASIAN AND AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS AS THEY RELATE TO THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE. 14

Paul Schachter: TRANSFORMATIONAL THEORY AND CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS. . 18

Robert D. Wilson: A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF SEGMENTS OF TRANSFORMATIONAL GRAMMARS OF ENGLISH AND TAGALOG 24

Lois McIntosh: LANGUAGE LESSONS BASED ON TRANSFORMATIONAL ANALYSIS. 29

Charles A. Ferguson: SOCIOLINGUISTICS FOR TEACHERS OF ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES 35

John C. Catford: SOCIOLINGUISTIC ASPECTS OF TRANSLATION AND LANGUAGE TEACHING. 41

John B. Carroll: RESEARCH IN SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING 46

Robert C. Gardner: PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENTS DEMANDED OF SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNERS. 51

Clifford H. Prator: GUIDELINES FOR PLANNING COURSES AND TEACHING MATERIALS 58

Leslie A. Palmer: AN OUTLINE FOR BUILDING CLASSROOM TESTS 63

Virginia French Allen: LISTENING AND READING: SOME PROCEDURES AND A PROPOSAL 67

Eloise Enata: GOALS FOR PRONUNCIATION: ACCEPTABLE PRODUCTION OR AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE PATTERNS?. 72

William R. Slager: CONTROLLING COMPOSITION: SOME PRACTICAL CLASSROOM TECHNIQUES. 77

Robert B. Kaplan: A CONTRASTIVE RHETORIC APPROACH TO READING AND WRITING 85

Robert P. Fox: A SURVEY OF UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE AT THE INTERMEDIATE AND ADVANCED LEVEL 94

Katherine C. Bang: THE ROLE OF THE NAFSA FIELD SERVICE PROGRAM IN STRENGTHENING THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE 97

Index: 100

A TRIBUTE TO CHARLES C. FRIES

Robert Lado, Georgetown University

Mr. Chairman, colleagues and friends. Thoughts and reminiscences of my cherished association with Charles C. Fries should be titled, "To Fries with Awe, A W E." During my long contact with this great man, I repeatedly had a feeling of inadequacy to cope with the vigor and multiplicity of facets of his mind and his heart. I was conscious that I could never write a biography of him, and as fate would have it, here I am trying to interpret the man to those who have come in contact with one or another of his contributions and who certainly will be aware of the inadequacy of what I can say.

This is not a chronology of what he has done. That would require a great deal of research and many interviews. This is not a biography of him. Perhaps the only one who could write his biography would be Mrs. Fries. This is a personal tribute in which I will share with you some of the moments in which it was my privilege to see him at close range. May I begin at the beginning of my acquaintance with him.

When I decided many years ago to go on to graduate work, my mentor in college advised me to look into the new field of English as a foreign language, in which a man named C. C. Fries was breaking new ground at Michigan. In the lobby of a hotel in downtown Tampa, Florida I had a meeting with my mentor, Professor Alfred J. Hanna of Rollins College where I had done my undergraduate work. I told him that I was indeed interested in the work of this man whose name I pronounced frayz. He was shocked at my pronunciation of the name and corrected me immediately: "It is Fries." Perhaps this is the first of my inadequate interpretations on the man we're honoring. I suppose I could have used this incident as one more example of the inadequacies of English spelling, a fact that he dramatically drove into my head when I became his student.

My second encounter with Fries was through his students at the University of Texas where I had gone to begin my graduate work. There, some of his views on grammar based on his modern English grammar were presented. As has been typical in his life, the significance and power of this contribution was not adequately granted, yet his work was at the heart of the presentation. And, as has been even more typical and significant, those who had come in contact with him were hard at work producing grammar and other materials on English.

My third encounter was with Fries in person in that northwest corner office of the Rackham building in Ann Arbor at that northwest corner desk which so many of us came to associate with him. I was finally attending my first Linguistics Institute, which he was directing, and I was there to have him guide me in selecting the courses I should take. Linguistics? Where was I going to begin? I tried to look him straight in the eye so he wouldn't notice how frightened I was. Facing linguistics, the University of Michigan, and Fries.... He gave me three courses; Pike's, Twaddell's, and, his own at my request. I have had ample time to regret this encounter because I have never stopped being dissatisfied with whatever work one finds time to do, and I have been stimulated beyond my capacity to do worthwhile things in language and cultural understanding.

For, whatever else he is, he has to be reckoned as a great teacher. The usual measuring scale for good teaching is inadequate for this man. He didn't give us neatly laid out lists of facts in his classes. He didn't return our term papers neatly graded and read in record time with little comments on the margin. He engaged his class in controversial discussions of grammar. He could be thrown off into controversial discussions of grammar by the most naive member of the class, we thought. But once you took his course in Modern English Grammar, you were never the same again.

He challenged us. I had had my first schooling in Spain where I learned to be very logical in my thinking regardless of the actual facts involved and had switched in my American schooling to the hodgepodge survey of facts regardless of their logic, and I do believe that if I had not come in contact with Fries, I would have gone on to be a very pleasant member of committees, looking always for consensus, regardless of the facts, or the logic. But Fries gave us a fascination for the study of language, from the observation of it to the actual counting of data after the struggle for insight, and he gave us a passion for understanding its system and structure. This is neither logic unencumbered by facts nor hodgepodge surveys of facts without insight and without logic. And with this passion for discovery, for truth, there is another secret to his greatness as a teacher. So many human beings either attempt to find followers who will merely accept what they say or do; or at the other extreme, so many human beings are happy with finding somebody else who will take responsibility for things so that they may comfortably follow blindly; but here again, Fries does not fit either mold. He encouraged each one of us to be creative. He encouraged us to choose research topics for our research papers that were not neat, that dealt with problems that were messy, difficult to cope with. I remember the anxiety of the class, the pleas that he give us a neat topic so that we could merely read up the sources and regurgitate the so-called facts that somebody else must have already found. This encouragement of our creative efforts, however inadequate they must have seemed to him at that time, has resulted in the lifetime change of all those students of his who have gone on in many fields to make contributions of their own, more often than not, without giving credit to the master or even without realizing were the stimulation came from.

Perhaps related to this quality as a teacher is the nature of Fries in his family. All of us have come in contact with what one or another member of this family has done. Take, for example, the great exploits of his children in swimming. I saw the movies in which they kept a record of the swimming experience of their son Peter. He received daily swimming lessons, or water experience, from the first few weeks of his life. And Fries got in the water with him so that Peter could see him at water level and gain confidence. This experiment proved that a child cannot maintain balance in the water much before he can maintain balance in walking. They succeeded in teaching Peter to swim at 9 months, the same month he learned to walk. And Peter has kept up his interest in swimming ever since, to a point at times that Mr. and Mrs. Fries were afraid he might attract other children of the same age into deeper water than they could handle.

Bobby Fries is a musician. In high school he wanted to devote all his time to music, and he could see no sense to mathematics, English grammar, and all the rest. Fries was never too busy to help Bobby with his homework, and Bobby, being fully aware of this, posed for a graduation picture which I still have in which he in turn awards Dr. Fries the diploma, since in all fairness, he had earned it.

And this might have been a fine thing if it could have been officially recorded, since Mr. Fries is about the only man that I know who has received the Ph.D. degree without completing high school. I don't know all the details of the case, but it seems that he fell sick during the year in which he was to graduate from high school, and he never did graduate. This didn't keep him from going on to college and to the Ph.D. and to a great career; all that is a matter of history. Could we say that Mr. Fries does not fit into the standard molds and usual cliches.

All the Fries children are creative and I am inclined to think that this is not all a matter of nature but that it is the result of the creative environment in which they were brought up.

I came under his family influence, and in 1953 after spending a semester on loan at the U. S. Office of Education when I prepared the Annotated Bibliography for Teachers of English as a Foreign Language, I was asked to become Director of the American Language Institute which at that time was at the American University in Washington. This was a very attractive offer and a chance for me to be in charge of my own program, and who wouldn't be attracted by such an opportunity. So I informed Dr. Fries that I was inclined to accept. He did not say no, but he invited me to spend a couple of days in his home. This was a momentous decision in my career, and we discussed the pros and cons for two solid days. It was quite obvious that he was concerned with my career and my future rather than his own aggrandizement since he was already at the peak of his reputation. Well, I stayed at Michigan; and I am grateful for the time he devoted to me those two critical days. Only a father, and not any father, would be willing to go that far in guiding a son. It was during this period that I wrote Linguistics Across Cultures and Language Testing, which would never have been written had I not stayed with Fries those extra years.

We all know how gentle and courteous this man is. No one who has come in contact with him fails to notice this and respond accordingly. But this gentleness and charm and courtesy and thoughtfulness should never be mistaken for softness and weakness. Mr. Fries is rugged. He thinks with vigor, and works hard, and plays hard, and drives relentlessly and long. Kenneth Pike and I and many others have had the privilege of playing water polo with him in a group with the misleading name, "The Flounders," for nothing could be more unlike the helpless flounder than the kind of water polo that Mr. Fries engages in, except perhaps for the fact that the flounder swims deep and most of us in the flounders spent a great deal of our time deep down. I was invited to participate in these regular noontime games and was reassured that there was a safety rule, namely, that a married man could not be held under water more than five minutes. The first few times I played, if you could call it playing, I was afraid that in the big pileups somebody would forget that there was a junior member of the flounders down at the bottom of the pile. Mr. Fries' game was known as unbeatable near the goal lines, where anyone coming within reach of his arm would be hopelessly locked in until the play was over. It took me six months to be reassured that I would not drown in one of these games.

Professor Warner Rice told me of many occasions when Dr. Fries would spend all night writing. He still kept this kind of pace during my years with him, and, I imagine, still pushes himself relentlessly even now. I understand that Mrs. Fries used to take apples up to his den in the attic in the wee hours of the night because he claimed that they kept him awake. I tried eating apples to stay awake and they don't work; it's something in the heart of the man that keeps him awake.

Fries' Modern English Grammar was a major contribution to the movement toward more scientific description of language. It is worthwhile reading today. His book Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language represented a milestone in the application of linguistics to language teaching and has remained a classic that has inspired countless thousands for a quarter of a century. His great effort in The Structure of English is even more important, and yet this is one in which the typical reaction to Fries is best illustrated: I feel there has been reluctance to give adequate credit to its contribution, yet it is at the very heart of the analysis of English structure. No wonder it set off a flurry of books and articles based on it. All subsequent work owes a heavy debt to it. A book that broke new ground and represented advance in a field as cultivated as that of English Grammar would obviously not be easy to grasp and interpret at once; yet like all great pioneering works, it was imitated and re-written and re-stated with minor additions, sometimes with no addition at all.

For those of us who had seen at close range the development of Fries' thought, The Structure of English was immediately clear. The unified structural treatment of English questions was original, elegant, and had major explanatory power. My own work on contrastive studies to predict language learning problems for teaching and testing was greatly facilitated.

I have his handwritten letters in which his struggle to ready the work for publication is dramatically illustrated. On March 29, 1951 he wrote, from Puerto Rico, "Here are Chapters V and VII...there is some information that didn't get in. I have the material in the hand-written copy I did first but it did not get into the version I wrote in Mexico." On April 9 he wrote, "Here is most of the last chapter. The rest will go off tomorrow but it's not ready tonight." On April 16, "This is again a rapid note to accompany these pages--the last of Chapter XIII." Then on April 18 he wrote, "Your letter telling me that the first part of Chapter XIII had not arrived reached me this afternoon. Luckily I had a copy and could have it typed at once. I enclose it here."

This book came out at just about the same time as the outline of

English Structure by Trager and Smith. And it was assumed on the face of it, since all three authors were linguists in the movement of the times, that the books were written in the same key; but they were not.

Trager and Smith had moved in the direction of phonetics for their starting point on the assumption that this was the way to get away from meaning as a descriptive criterion, and they almost succeeded. Almost, since they do fall back on contrast on occasion, and the problem of free variation remained unsolved.

They also suggested how they believed the syntax could be described in secular terms but did not describe it. Fries used spoken English data from telephone conversations. He began at the other end of the linguistic spectrum, the utterance, classifying them according to observable outside criteria before describing their internal structure. This is a very different approach from that of Trager and Smith.

Chomsky later showed that you really cannot handle syntax adequately by proceeding from phonology up, but linguistics' students at the linguistic institute at the time were encouraged to think that if it wasn't a la Trager-Smith it couldn't be scientific.

Yet Fries had handled more syntax more adequately than anyone else, and the rash of books on English structure that appeared in short succession as a result of it had many more pages of Fries than of Trager and Smith. Yet the credit emphasis in the prefaces was the opposite.

I could tell you more. Warfel had attacked Fries bitterly in a monograph curiously entitled Who Killed Grammar? I remember hearing Fries chuckle at the violence of the attack. Then Warfel did an about face and co-authored a book that used Trager and Smith, and of all people, Fries. And the credit was particularly stingy toward Fries in this case.

Fries has faced up to some basic epistemological questions in this study which the transformationalists haven't attempted to face yet. The Structure of English is worth revisiting now as much as ever.

You have seen his book for the English material for Japan. That work delayed the completion of Linguistics and Reading, which finally appeared and typically contains a fresh new look at reading.

There are many more facets to this man. His Early Modern English dictionary, his struggle with the sensational misinterpretation of his views in the press, his work in Puerto Rico, his struggle with some publishers who insisted on boxing him into the normal pigeonholes.

But I must close. And as I do, I share with you the inner conviction that this man, with only 24 hours to each of his days, must needs have won the crown of an immortal soul not just in words and the memory of man, who is apt to forget, but for all time, and beyond.

CURRICULUM PATTERNS IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Mary Finocchiaro, Hunter College

Let me begin by telling you how flattered and pleased I felt when your chairman, Professor Aston, called to ask me to participate in this conference. But it was not until Jim Alatis, Sirarpi O'Hanessian and I sat at breakfast at a recent conference and Jim asked me for my definition of curriculum that I realized what a herculean task I had undertaken in trying to cover the topic adequately in twenty minutes.

I was even more certain that I should have changed my topic when I reread the standard texts and looked through recent articles in teaching English as a second language and found that the word curriculum is not even mentioned. And yet, curriculum as a fundamental concept in educational programs fills numerous volumes. Might this apparent neglect be merely a question of semantics? May it be due to the fact that in our profession writers use curriculum synonymously with syllabus or course of study? If so, how do these relate to current thinking in curriculum development?

To answer that question, it might be desirable to start our discussion with a brief examination of some patterns of English Language programs in colleges and universities in the United States and with a definition of curriculum to note points of congruence or divergence between them.

Both student placement and scope and presentation of content must underlie any discussion of curriculum.

Various patterns of class organization have emerged in our growing foreign student programs not only with relation to the teaching of content but also with relation to student placement.

In some colleges, different instructors are responsible for teaching the same group of students, pronunciation, structure, or vocabulary. Still other instructors teach reading, oral expression, composition, or area study.

In other colleges, the same instructor is asked to teach the phonology, structure, and vocabulary of English and to develop the skills of listening and speaking. Reading, composition, and culture, however, may be taught by others.

With relation to student placement, patterns are not often clear cut and depend to a great extent on administrative expediency. Whereas, in most instances, attempts are made through testing and examination of students' previous records to place students according to level of English ability, little differentiation is made based on such fundamental factors as the length of time the student plans to spend in the United States; whether the English course will be a terminal program for him; or a basic course which will enable him to go on to a B.A. degree or to a graduate degree in a specialized discipline; and last, but perhaps most important, what the aspirations and expectations of the student may be. You will understand, of course that I am making a generalization. Individual colleges and many individual teachers do take cognizance of these differences in developing programs.

We are concerned at this Conference, however, with re-evaluating our current offerings and with exploring patterns and procedures which may point toward stronger programs for the foreign students while giving teachers and curriculum writers a more definite sense of purpose and direction.

Let us turn now to a definition of curriculum and to the integral characteristics of a curriculum. Let us see how education as a discipline--too often looked upon with disfavor by many scholars--could add some dimension to our thinking about English as a second language. As I attend more meetings and observe more teachers I am increasingly convinced that some of us in this field have been too provincial in our approach. We do not seem sufficiently aware that we have much to gain--also much to contribute, of course--by studying the principles or methodological approaches of other disciplines.

A curriculum is generally defined as all the experiences and activities in which students engage in and out of school leading to the successful achievement of program objectives. Objectives are thought of in terms of the acquisition of or change in attitudes, habits, knowledge, and skills.

Programs in English as a second language focus mainly on three of these objectives. Habit formation--an expression unfortunately frequently misunderstood--has become the rallying cry or I might say shibboleth of a large number of persons in the language teaching field. The ability to use the skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing is recognized as desired terminal behavior in most English programs. A knowledge of morphology, syntax, vocabulary, sound formation, and suprasegmentals is assumed in listening, speaking, reading, or writing skills. Under the category of knowledge we could also include cultural insights, kinesics, or paralinguistics.

The lacuna in our thinking and consequently in courses of study, articles, or textbooks appears to be in not ascribing sufficient importance to attitudes and to the impact on his learning of the student's activities and experiences not only in the class but also in the community in which he is now living.

While minute attention in literature relating to English as a second language has been paid to such admittedly important linguistic or teaching components as the number of stresses in words and sentences, morphophonemic differences of plural morphemes, patterns of choral repetition, or the necessity of rigidly structured sequence in item presentation, we have not kept sight of the fact that we are teaching these to individuals recently arrived in an English community and that the individual's attitude toward English speakers, toward English customs and values in his new English cultural milieu play a crucial role in the learning process. Crucial too, of course, in the learning process is the teacher's attitude toward his students not only as persons but also as learners.

Studies by Agard and Dunkel, by Carroll, by Rivers, and by Lambert point unmistakably to student motivation and attitudes as factors in learning which far outweigh approach, method, or techniques. I would not want you to infer from this statement that appropriate approaches, methods, or techniques could not engender or sustain motivation. Indeed, all teachers are aware that certain procedures can enhance or develop positive attitudes; but it seems to me that we court failure of students and a feeling of failure on the part of teachers when we take insufficient account of the importance of student attitudes in planning programs or curricula or when we don't take into account a teacher's frustration at having, for example, to coordinate his teaching with that of his colleagues, when one person is responsible for pronunciation, another for vocabulary, another for structure. While reinforcement of student learning could be a desirable outcome of the inevitable overlapping in such programs, lack of integration of materials can result in a fragmented, piecemeal knowledge which will retard real communication on the part of students.

Let us return to a consideration of student attitudes. Positive attitudes, as we know, are the result of an individual's feeling of belonging, of status, of success, of achievement, or of a diminution of tension brought about by a satisfaction of a goal which the student himself perceives as important. Positive attitudes will result in English programs in which students can achieve success because they belong and can function in the classes in which they are placed, in which teachers make students aware that they know their linguistic needs and linguistic or vocational aspirations; and in which an explicitly written curriculum allows for differentiated instruction to meet students' needs and aspirations.

Such a curriculum is possible even in schools where small numbers of foreign students may make placement in homogeneous classes financially unfeasible, if teachers learn to work with sub-groups in a class and if instructional material is available for these sub-groups. Let me hasten to say that by explicitly written curriculum I am by no means recommending a rigidly structured, fixed curriculum which inhibits a teacher's creativity or which defeats the very thing I am advocating.

In fact, flexibility in scope and sequence of language items--unless the material has an inherent order which cannot be altered--and flexibility in methodology are fundamental principles in curriculum development

Let me enumerate very briefly other fundamental premises of curriculum development. First: the curriculum should reflect realistic objectives. These should be based on such considerations as the length of the course--80 hours--one year--two years--four years--and the aspirations and needs of the students. In addition to their general purpose for English study that I mentioned earlier, it is important to consider, in writing a curriculum, those language learning activities and experiences which take cognizance of the use to which the students intend to put their English knowledge, at least in their immediate foreseeable future. This point--called registers by some or functional use by others--has been made by me in several texts, by Halliday and his co-author, and recently in talks by Professors Donald Bowen and Ruth Crymes.

Second: The curriculum should provide for continuity of instruction both horizontal and vertical. I have found that most professors--even the most dedicated and conscientious ones--find it virtually impossible to achieve horizontal continuity; that is, to integrate English language skills, when, in the same semester and to the same group of students, one teaches pronunciation while another teaches grammar. Continuity of instruction on a vertical level--or articulation as it is often called--also presents difficulty. It would be helpful to have a curriculum for each learning level explicitly and fully spelled out and staff members aware not only of the probable content, activities, and experiences of students who come to them from less advanced levels but also of the expectations of instructors who will teach their students at the next higher level.

Third: The curriculum should provide integrative experiences in which all students learn a given body of content. For example, all students would be given enough practice in the phonological aspects of English to be understood. All might be taught to use contextual clues to understand unfamiliar reading. All would learn the language utterances they need to make a personal-social adjustment to their community. All might learn to write letters, of thanks or of inquiry, and eventually even of protest. The curriculum, however, should also provide for the inclusion of differentiating experiences which recognize the uniqueness of each individual. Not all of the students, for example, need to understand or produce allophonic differences unless they're going to be broadcasters or teachers. Not all could be expected to create plays or write essays on abstract topics. You and I know that few native speakers of English are capable of doing that. However, it is imperative that enrichment experiences be offered to individuals who have the potential and will be engaged in teaching, broadcasting, or playwriting.

Fourth: The curriculum should provide for flexibility in methodology. It is unrealistic to expect that all students will profit from any one approach, method, or technique. Since we don't really know how learning takes place in the human organism, we do students an injustice when we adhere strictly to such unproved language learning assumptions, practices, or cliches that, for example, students should never talk about the language (What does that really mean? Good language teachers never spent any time talking about the language. Why do we always equate teaching practices of poor teachers in the past with the wonder practices of good teachers today.) or that reading should be deferred for x number of hours, or that long dialogues need to be memorized, or that the use of the student's native language may be fatal, or that a prescribed sequence of learning must be followed without deviation, or that rules or generalizations should never be give, or that all grammar should be taught through transformation rules, etc. Many of you know my feelings about such matters, and I will not go into further detail at this time. Flexibility in methodology also requires adaptation based on the known experiences of students outside of the classroom. Visits, interviews, use of programmed texts or language laboratory work should be integrated into the classroom period.

Fifth: The curriculum should make provision for continuous evaluation not only of the students' growth but also of the curriculum itself--including, since curriculum is an inclusive term, objectives, content, activities, and experiences, related instructional materials, and methods.

Imbalance in the curriculum may stem from objectives which are not clearly defined, from content which is insufficient or not geared to the students' abilities or needs, from language activities which over-emphasize one feature or skill to the neglect and detriment of another. Experimentation in this regard proves what good teachers know, namely that we learn what we practice. Students learn to construct new sentences when they are given varied, systematic practice in doing so; they learn to respond to a communication stimulus when they have been given many opportunities in class to do so.

Imbalance, of course, may be the result of factors within the students themselves. Native intelligence, and the native language spoken, attitudes of prejudice for whatever social or political reason, and psychological problems impinge on the curriculum.

We ourselves as teachers may often be at the root of imbalance because we are afraid to try new techniques or because we rush into accepting practices or procedures without seeking the rationale behind them or, more importantly, without asking ourselves whether they can work with our students, with our teaching personalities, in our colleges, and in our communities.

Lack of facilities in the school for reinforcing learning, administration indifference, or lack of know-how cannot help but have some impact on what goes on in each English classroom--the place where the curriculum is put to an acid test.

Instead of enumerating more problems, let me share with you some thoughts on possible solutions or possible experimental studies with relation to curriculum development in its broad sense. Some of the suggestions are implicit in the problem. Briefly stated, some administrative measures would include: 1) the evaluation of a student's record based on a knowledge of the school system from which the record has come; 2) the placement of students in classes where they can function best with an explanation of the placement procedure to the student, where such explanation appears necessary; 3) the assignment of teachers on the basis of their background, their studies, and their preferences; 4) the scheduling of frequent teacher meetings devoted to the integration of course content and to the evaluation of students' progress. This is especially important when more than one teacher teaches the same student grammar, pronunciation, etc.; 5) maintenance of adequate student records, course descriptions, bibliographies, and other pertinent material to provide necessary information to ease the student's transition from one level to another; 6) arrangement of a program of co-curricular activities for the students. These may range from tutorial work, to language laboratory assignments, to week-end or holiday visits with American students.

My next category of solutions might be placed under supervisory procedures. While I am aware that at the college level supervision is frowned upon and is often considered an infringement on the individual instructor's academic freedom, I feel that, since many new teachers are needed to cope with the burgeoning college population, some democratic, helpful, cooperative supervision of programs, of practices, and of new staff members, would be welcomed by teachers and students. A supervisor or colleague consultant chosen from among experienced teachers, for example, could help in many ways if some free program time could be given to him. For example, he could: 1) cooperate with his colleagues in establishing realistic course objectives after studying programs and practices in many other colleges; 2) assist in the preparation of a curriculum by inviting resource persons, setting up a curriculum library, or examining programs from government agencies or other colleges; 3) make sure that curricula were being prepared for the various courses in which English was being taught and that the units of work within each of the courses included provision for group and individual learning activities, for drills, for communication experiences, and for evaluation; 4) bring to the new teacher's attention, through meetings, newsletters, and visits, the results of experimentation in English as a second language and any other related area; 5) provide for continuous feedback of the curriculum through such devices as talks with teachers, study of students' compositions or test results and recommend changes in the curriculum based on such feedback, and 6) and most important, provide continuous in-service training of teachers. I realize that in-service training is virtually unheard of at the college level. Somehow, somewhere, the notion took root and grew that all college teachers need is a thorough knowledge of their subject in order to teach it. The notion seems to be even more deeply entrenched where English as a second language is concerned. Anyone who knows his native language can teach it. This, as we all know, is far from the truth. Teachers of English as a second language need, as do all teachers, knowledge of their subject, but they need to know more about methodology than teachers of other subjects. Whereas a teacher of the social sciences or the physical sciences, for example, can lecture--well or badly depending on his interest and skill--the teacher of English as a second language must help his students develop or expand concepts in a new medium. He must teach him to understand and give new form and expression to what may be an unfamiliar world. It might be desirable, therefore, if a supervisor or colleague consultant could set up a program of intervisitation or of demonstrations followed by constructive evaluation.

The teacher's role is complex and central in programs for foreign students. The teacher needs to be a combination psychologist, educationist, sociologist, and anthropologist.

What are some of the dimensions of the teacher's task as far as the curriculum is concerned? He should modify curriculum content as he ascertains the aspirations of his students. He should make every effort to help the students achieve their aspirations or redirect these into attainable, more realistic channels. With relation to aspirations, he must realize that what one student may consider success may not be success for another.

He should keep the motivation of students at a high level not only by varying his method of presentation or his instructional materials but also by giving students a sense of security, success, and achievement. Recent studies have shown, for example, that students experience great tension when they are taught with an audio-lingual approach exclusively for too long a time. They cannot be helped by the partial predictability cues we use in hearing speakers in our native language.

The teacher should provide for individual differences. Students have different learning capacities and different degrees of skill. Individuals learn in different ways and at different rates; some learn by intensive repetition and overlearning; some learn best by trial and error; some learn by applying generalizations to new situations. The activities and experiences suggested in the curriculum as well as the methodology of the teacher should reflect an awareness of these differences.

Individual differences among our students demand a variety of appropriate drills and materials not only related to their interests but also geared to their ability level. Such materials may need to focus on problems of phonology, structure, lexicon, reading, or writing. They may be for whole-class presentation, for sub-groups in the class, or for individuals.

The good teacher recognizes the importance of integrating discrete language skills into communication situations which simulate or duplicate the real situations in which our students will need to use English.

The skillful teacher will integrate students out-of-class work or probable community experiences with the classroom recitation. Those activities in particular which the teacher has assigned such as a visit to the language laboratory, or listening to recordings, or studying from a programed text should be referred to and taken into account in the classroom.

The master teacher will recognize that our foreign students will need to use English both as a tool and as a means of identifying with their new community--what Lambert calls "instrumental and integrative orientation." A curriculum implemented in an encouraging classroom climate in which both orientations are fostered is in my opinion the desideratum of English programs.

In closing, I wish to stress that there is no one pattern of curriculum development nor should there be. While there are many constants in any curriculum, adaptations of specific bodies of content or of activities and experiences will have to be made depending on our student population, the resources in the school and community, and our own skills, abilities, and creativity as teachers.

I should like to recommend to this organization, however, that it consider forming a committee of its members--all of whom are concerned with foreign students--to prepare a corpus of materials and related integrative and differentiating activities and experiences for various levels of learning and for two or three tracks.

The increasing number of foreign students in our colleges and the need for new teachers, makes the preparation of a resource curriculum which might be flexibly used and locally adapted a logical next step for this Organization. I realize that the formulation of such a curriculum calls for an impressive amount of time and devotion, but the history of this Organization is one of repeated documentation of the fact that its members have never hesitated to accept any task--no matter how large--which would result in a greater service to our foreign students and, in so doing, to our nation.

PATTERNS OF TEACHER PREPARATION IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES

Sirarpi Ohannessian, C.A.L.

I would like to begin with a statement made by Professor J. Milton Cowan of Cornell University at the Ann Arbor Conference on Linguistics and the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language held in 1957.

> We should be clear about one point. America is not going to supply professional teachers of English to meet the world demand for such instruction. Americans don't like to stay away from home very long, for one thing. The teaching of English as a foreign language is not likely ever to be a profession for very many Americans. There are a few positions at universities which provide help to foreign students on their campuses. But the teaching of English as a foreign language can be made a very useful apprenticeship for a young person working ultimately toward an academic career in any of the humanistic disciplines, or in business--or even, for that matter, in linguistics.

Nine years later, at last year's TESOL Conference in San Diego, Professor Cowan quoted his former statement, saying that, confronted with the enormous range of professional interest present in San Diego, he felt he had been unduly narrow and pessimistic "way back in the early prehistory of interest in this subject," that is, 1957.

What is perhaps most significant about the teaching of English to speakers of other languages is this tremendously rapid expansion of American interest and activity in the field. Professor Cowan's two statements are indicative more of this rapid change than of pessimism on his part. The change is, naturally, strongly reflected in increased activity in teacher training.

According to surveys by the Center for Applied Linguistics from 1960 to the present, the number of United States institutions offering Ph.D. degrees with concentration in this field had increased from three to six, those offering M.A. or M.S. degrees from eight to twenty-five, and, while no B.S. or B.A. programs were reported in 1960, there were ten which offered them in 1966. Thirty-five institutions offered one or more courses in this field in 1963; thirty-five institutions offered three or more courses in 1966.

The growth of these training programs at the university level is but a partial reflection of an even more dramatically expanding picture. Both in the United States and abroad there are many programs of varying aim and duration which have developed to meet new needs and demands.

The increased demand abroad is in some ways older than that at home and stems partly from the fact that English has become the most widely learned of the present-day languages of wider communication, but also partly from political, economic, and social changes which have affected the education of increasingly larger numbers of people. In the United States the attention given to the needs of non-English speakers, rather than the need itself, is new.

Until recently, the problems of foreign students dominated the attention of linguists. Recent social and economic developments have made federal, foundation, state, and city money available to help overcome the language handicaps of children in minority groups. The increasing importance of proficiency and literacy in English for employability is already causing some attention to be given to the long neglected language problems of youths and adults, both native born and immigrant, who are not academically oriented and who do not speak English as a native language.

A complex machinery is developing to meet these growing needs, and several patterns of teacher preparation are emerging. The most important and well established of these patterns is the degree program at the university level, and the clearest division in patterns of teacher training can be made between this and non-degree programs offered by universities and other institutions.

Although there are many long-term, non-degree programs overseas, those in the United States are usually of shorter duration and can be roughly divided into two main categories. The first is the institute type of program, which lasts from about two to three months or more. The second is the orientation or workshop type of program, which lasts from a few days to a few weeks. These sometimes form part of in-service training programs, but are also independently organized and offered to one group at one time, often in the form of conferences and seminars.

In-service training shares many features with the orientation type of program, but represents continued work with the same groups. Besides, universities such as New York University and Columbia, which give in-service training to the staffs of their substantial programs in English for foreign students, state and city systems of education provide training through coordinators and language specialists, and through periodical meetings, workshops, and sometimes the use of mass media such as television. In-service or orientation programs are also offered to teachers overseas, sometimes through the sponsorship of United States Government agencies and foundations.

Although exact figures are not easy to obtain about the number of people being trained in these various types of programs, I would like to illustrate the extent of their use with a few examples.

The use of university programs can be illustrated from figures obtained from eleven United States universities during 1964-65, which, with enrollments varying from one to 176 students, had a total enrollment of over 820. Of these, about 460 were non-native speakers, who came from 42 foreign countries and Puerto Rico, and 350 were native speakers of English.

The use of the seminar type of program can be illustrated from Peace Corps Volunteer training programs and National Defense Education Act summer institutes for teachers of English as a second language. In 1964, 36 out of 92 Peace Corps training programs included some instruction in teaching English as a foreign language, and 1,699 Volunteers were teaching English in 41 different countries. The present Peace Corps policy is to include some TESOL training in all programs. In 1964, there were two NDEA summer institutes which retrained 110 teachers; in 1965, there were four which retrained 270 teachers. Five institutes are planned for 1966.

The use of the orientation type of program may be illustrated by figures obtained from the United States Information Agency, which in 1964 ran 106 seminars in 33 countries reaching about 8,000 local teachers. Hundreds of teachers attend workshops in the United States, especially in in-service programs. During 1963, for instance, there was a weekly attendance of 80 at a course organized by the Bureau of Curriculum Research of the City of New York.

It is clear that both degree and non-degree programs are in great demand. What, then, are the characteristics and patterns of these programs? There is no need for me to go into great detail on university programs for this audience. The Center for Applied Linguistics has just published a survey of teacher training programs in TESOL in twelve universities--one in Canada and eleven in the United States, A Survey of Twelve University Programs for the Preparation of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. I would like to refer you to this study for a fairly detailed picture of practices in the preparation of specialists at the Ph.D., M.A., and B.A. levels. We have not, as yet, prepared such a study on short-term training, but based on some information we do have and on personal contact with a few programs, I would like to try to enumerate some of their characteristics.

Aside from their short duration, one very important characteristic of these programs seems to be the fact that they are planned for fairly homogeneous groups which have similar aims. This has very important implications for the pattern and content of the training they offer, since they attempt to provide specific preparation for specific situations. The attempt may not always be successful, given the limited amount of time and other factors involved, but it often points up facets of training which may not have had sufficient attention given to them so far.

May I first take the orientation or workshop type of program and illustrate a few characteristics presented by them through three examples?

The United States Information Agency and the Foreign Service Institute in Washington run a week-long seminar for wives of foreign service officers preparing for overseas duty. These ladies have had no training in TESOL, but may be involved in at least informal English teaching overseas. The orientation given to them includes a maximum of practical work in the form of demonstration lessons, dialogues, choral repetition and substitution drills, pronunciation drills, and conversation classes, as well as a session on the sound system of English. Besides this, the trainees are shown films, instructed in the use of audio-visual aids, assigned reading which is later discussed, and exposed to materials in the field. One entire session is devoted to the TEFL activities of United States Government agencies overseas, and information is given on types of work likely for the trainees.

The United States Information Agency has for some years brought groups of directors of overseas binational centers for a few weeks' training in the United States. These people will not necessarily teach English, but they will be responsible for it. Besides time devoted to such subjects as English, linguistics, and methods and techniques of language teaching, the program usually includes such topics as "seminars for national teachers and curriculum planning," "organization of language programs," "student counseling," and other topics that have a direct bearing on the duties of the trainees when they return to their posts.

A state education system offers a third example. In 1963, the Department of Elementary Education of the State of California ran a three week conference seminar for teachers and administrators. The schedule included a series of introductory lectures on linguistics and on the various aspects of Mexican-American culture, as well as observation lessons, subsequent discussion, and the showing of films on language teaching. Perhaps the most significant result of this conference was the interest it aroused in linguistics and its application to the problems of non-English speaking children in California, which resulted not only in similar workshops and conferences but in greatly renewed activity in this field in California.

The longer institute type of program is best exemplified by the National Defense Education Act summer institutes and the Peace Corps Volunteer training programs. In the limited time we have, I would like to point out some of the salient characteristics of these, rather than to go into details of proportionate course work in linguistics, methodology, or other aspects of training.

The most important difference between the type of program offered by the Peace Corps and that offered by the National Defense Education Act summer institutes is that, while the Peace Corps Volunteers are usually new teachers being trained to teach for about two years in a particular country overseas, the NDEA participants are experienced teachers receiving further training before returning to their own posts. Both groups have, in general, elementary and secondary schools as the levels at which they will work, but Peace Corps Volunteers are sometimes also asked to work in teacher training colleges and universities. (It is interesting to note that TESOL may not be the central focus of the careers of members of either group, since Peace Corps Volunteers may go on to other occupations on their return, and NDEA teachers may have the teaching of English to native speakers as their occupation.)

Besides the situational variation, programs in both types of training often vary in emphasis according to the institutions that carry them out and the experience, interests, and preparation of the personnel conducting them. The Peace Corps programs receive some direction and guidance from the central office in Washington or the Peace Corps representative overseas, as do NDEA institutes from the Office of Education. Some of the NDEA institutes have built-in evaluation systems, and in 1964 a team of evaluators studied two institutes and presented a set of recommendations to the Office of Education. Both types of program provide a substantial number of extracurricular activities, use outside lecturers, and rely fairly heavily on films and audio-visual aids for training.

In general they have stressed the practical aspects of teacher training more than have university programs. All six NDEA institutes held so far, for example, have provided demonstration classes and some kind of practical experience to trainees through actual classroom teaching, tutoring, or language laboratory work. Peace Corps programs are not always fortunate enough to be in areas where such teaching can take place, but a great deal of peer group teaching takes place, and in some cases there is practice teaching arranged in such areas as French-speaking Canada, where Volunteers are sent for training prior to going to Francophone Africa. One interesting pattern that has developed is the carrying out of Volunteer training partly in the United States and partly in the host country.

All six NDEA institutes devoted a relatively large amount of time to the cultural and sociological aspects of English teaching, sometimes giving even more time to this than to linguistics and methodology. The Peace Corps programs also devote a great deal of time to an understanding of the culture and attitudes in host countries, often offering firsthand information on the school system, the place of English, and materials used, through the employment in their training programs of either returned Volunteers or appropriate nationals of the host country who happen to be in the United States.

One very significant characteristic of Peace Corps Volunteer training programs is the learning of a new language, often a non-Indo-European one, as part of the training, and for actual use in the host country. Most NDEA institutes use the idea of a "shock" language, usually Spanish, which is taught to participants often for the entire duration of the institute. Whatever the reason for this type of activity in the process of preparation for the teaching of English, it must surely have a very important effect on the trainee's insight into both the linguistic and the methodological problems of language teaching. Where there is close coordination between this activity and the methodology component of TESOL training, provided both are sound, the results cannot fail to be beneficial. In at least two institutions experimentation is going on in the formalizing of this type of coordination.

These, then, are some of the salient characteristics of short-term training programs. I have touched only very briefly on their content, partly because of lack of time, but partly because we do not have information on a representative number from which to generalize. I would like to say, however, that of those on which we do have information. some are compactly organized, seem to give a meximum amount of guidance in the time available, provide information on further reading, and make use of all available aids in the training of their teachers. Others seem not so well organized, over-ambitious, and sometimes show little awareness of materials and developments in the field.

However good it may be, no short-term program can give the depth of preparation necessary for certain levels of activity which the university can provide. For this reason there is a certain amount of misgiving on the part of universities about the value of short-term training, though many of them assume responsibility for such training themselves and give credit for it. Part of the reason for the demand for short-term training is that university training is not feasible for the thousands of teachers who need help quickly to meet new situations. Our present university resources would hardly be sufficient to provide training for the numbers involved, nor, indeed, would most teachers who can be freed for brief periods of training have the available time for longer university work. Also, in the case of some NDEA teachers, TESOL will be only a part of their overall activities; and, in the case of some Peace Corps Volunteers, it will be only a temporary occupation. Professor Cowan's remark about TESOL's being "a very useful apprenticeship" towards other careers is still true, though in a different form.

The field of TESOL has developed sufficiently for a division of labor to have become necessary. The field now needs administrators and policy makers with an understanding of the social and political, as well as linguistics and pedagogical, factors involved in TESOL all over the world; it needs linguists with sophistication in language learning and pedagogy who can prepare materials, a very specialized task nowadays; it needs trainers of teachers with sound training in linguistics, pedagogy, and psychology, as well as an understanding of techniques of classroom presentation; and it needs full-time teachers for various levels.

For all these tasks university training seems essential. Short-term training, at least for Americans, appears to be generally used for those who will be either partly or temporarily involved in TESOL. There seem to be two great dangers, however, in short-term training: first, the danger that the trainee will assume he knows all there is to know about the field; and second, that he will be taken for a specialist and given more responsibility than he is able to carry. It seems to me essential, therefore, to give very careful attention as to exactly what can be done in the short time available, in order to make it of maximum value and minimum danger. A first step might be the collecting of precise information on the content and organization of a number of these programs and, if at all possible, on their effectiveness. We might then be able to make more definite generalizations and, with the help of those experienced in conducting such programs and of specialists in various aspects of the field, make recommendations for their better utilization.

In the meantime, since these programs have become one of the accepted patterns of teacher training, I would like to point out what seem to me some of the contributions they are making to the field. Besides the training load that they have carried, they have shown the value of practical experience during training, an aspect of training which has been often neglected in university programs, as reflected in the survey referred to above. They have drawn attention to the merits of training groups with similar aims, so that more precise information and instruction may be supplied. They have demonstrated the importance of the cultural aspects of language teaching, which have again received relatively little attention in TESOL programs in universities. The value of a "shock" language as part of training is an idea perhaps exploited more in these programs than in the longer programs, and, perhaps most importantly, they have drawn attention to the problems of children in elementary and secondary schools, which are only just beginning to have serious attention from most universities. What seems most significant in these programs is the sense of experimentation and the need to face real problems in real situations. As I said before, these experimentations may not be successful, and some may even be misguided and misdirected; but they point the way to new approaches and, with help and guidance from the longer established university programs, may lead to new insight in language teaching and new patterns of teacher training.

A COMPARISON OF SOME REPRESENTATIVE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS OF ASIA WITH THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Bryce Van Syoc, Southern Illinois University

In this paper I aim to make a brief comparison of four selected educational systems of Asia with the educational system in the United States in regard to foreign language teaching. The countries I have chosen are Indonesia, South Vietnam, Thailand, and Taiwan. I have worked in the first three countries, and am basing my remarks on Taiwan upon information sent to me by the principal of a Middle School there, a former student of mine at the University of Michigan.

The purpose of the paper is to consider the implications such a comparison has for us, as teachers of English as a second language, who will either be concerned with foreign students coming to this country to study or with teacher trainees going to Asia to work as English teachers or trainers of English teachers. I will discuss briefly the elementary school, the junior high school, the senior high school, the university, and the teacher-training programs.

Probably all of you know as much as I do about the foreign language program in the American schools. My observation and inquiries indicate that there is no consistent pattern. Some schools start foreign language training in third grade, some in fifth, others with the beginning of junior high schools, and still others at the beginning of senior high school, or even in the eleventh grade. There is also great diversity in the foreign language programs in American colleges and universities, ranging from the occasional college that has no language requirements to those which require four years of language training.

Some of our school systems start foreign language programs in the elementary schools but discontinue them in a short time because they can't find enough properly trained teachers or because the curricula are already crowded with classes in natural science, social science, physical education, fine arts, etc., etc.; or because the students (or their parents) lose interest; or because the board of education decides such programs are a waste of time and money. Other school systems apparently have very successful ongoing programs on the elementary school level.

Now let us consider the organization of the school system in general in the four Asian countries I mentioned, and see how language instruction fits into the curricula at the different levels. Most of the schools are organized on a graded plan comparable to ours; that is, there are six years of elementary instruction, three years of junior high school, and either three or four years of senior high school. Although Thailand has a two-year senior high school course which may be terminal, or may be followed by two more years of either technical training or college preparatory work, the university program is essentially the same as the American university or college program. There is, however, one big difference between the educational systems of the four Asian countries under consideration and our own, and that is that the final authority on educational programs in those countries is vested in the Ministry of Education of each country, so that the programing within each country is quite consistent throughout the land. In other words, what is done in one school is, more or less, done in all other schools on the same level.

Like the average American child, the Asian child starts to school at about age 5 or 6. The kindergarten, which is almost universal in the American school system, is so far mostly just an ideal in the Asian countries and has not been widely accepted. More often that not the child starts his school career with what might seem to us an abrupt exposure to acedemic life. In the countries I had an opportunity to observe, which included Laos, Cambodia, and Burma, as well as the countries in which I worked, the children start their day as early as 6:30 or 7:00 a.m. and return home at noon. In the afternoon the buildings are often used by a completely different school, under different administrators. Such a short day virtually precludes adding anything to the basic curriculum established by the Ministry of Education. With the exception of Thailand, the instruction in foreign language is delayed until the seventh grade in the countries I am using for comparison purposes, so that the optimum moment for learning a foreign language, according to the theories of many linguists and psychologists, is lost. However, in Indonesia the average child already speaks his regional language, such as Javanese, Balinese, or Sundanese, and some Indonesian, the national language, before he starts to school. His schooling is generally in Indonesian, so by the time he finishes elementary school, he is already rather sophisticated as far as language is concerned. In Thailand, by the time a child enters the seventh grade, he has already had three years of oral and written drill in English four or five times a week, so he too has a higher degree of linguistic sophistication than the average American child, although his English proficiency may be pretty poor. English teaching in the Thai elementary schools suffers from the fact that once a teacher becomes proficient in English he can find a better job in some other occupation than teaching. The better English teachers start out teaching in the higher grades, where they enjoy more prestige and better pay. The English supervisors in the Ministry of Education and I often discussed whether it wouldn't be better to start English teaching at the Junior High level, but with modern methods of teaching English going into effect, one hesitated to take the formal step of recommending a postponement. The English teaching at all levels was showing great improvement as the result of the widespread teacher-training programs.

For the most part, then, the Asian child does not study a foreign language until he reaches the junior high school. And with the exception of the children in the relatively few schools in the United States that went wholeheartedly into the FLES program 10 or 12 years ago, neither does the American child. Incidentally, it seems to me we could be in considerable difficulty if we insisted on teaching a foreign language to every elementary child in American because there wouldn't be enough qualified teachers to do the job well, either now or in the forseeable future.

There is no doubt, though, that language sophistication facilitates language learning. The Indonesian children who formerly had learned Dutch early in their school career when Indonesia was part of the Dutch Empire, and the South Vietnamese and Laotians who had learned French when they were part of the French Empire, have not found learning a third or fourth language so formidable as the American child does encountering French, Spanish, or German at the junior or senior high level.

Until recent years--say the last 10 or 15--English instruction at the junior high school level in Asia had been of the traditional type. Grammar was taught in a prescriptive manner with the traditional rules. The better students gained some competence in talking about English, but their ability to perform in English was usually less than impressive. Drilling was mainly of the written type. Reading was done with word-for-word translation, and comprehension was hazy.

The picture has changed, however, in the past decade and a half. All these countries have made great efforts to improve the teaching of English, especially at the junior high level. Textbooks based on linguistic principles are rapidly replacing the traditional-type textbooks. Teachers have been taught to drill the students orally. Seminars are being held to improve the teachers' competence both in their command of English and in classroom techniques. The Ministries of Education are sending out to the provinces supervisors who are well qualified both in linguistics and in English, and who are well able to proffer aid to the junior high school teachers. Both students and teachers are now accustomed to pronunciation drills and pattern practice, and understand the importance of attaining the four skills of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. In the Asian countries I know about, the teachers at the junior high school level have had the equivalent of two years of university training.

The situation is less encouraging on the senior high school level. The well-established, older teachers are less receptive to new methods and techniques. Their goals even for the college-preparatory classes are quite conservative. Even after six to nine years of training in English, the students do not show the proficiency one might expect, usually still reading English novels only in simplified form or reading technical books written on an elementary level.

Another deterring factor to good English teaching has been that the tests set up by the Ministries of Education have been of the traditional type, testing knowledge about the language rather than the ability to use it. The English supervisors in the Ministries, however, are aware of this problem now and are making every effort to revise their examinations so that they will be more appropriate in terms of the newer types of instruction. This is especially true in Thailand.

English programs at the college level vary as to the amount of English required, but most Freshman in all the countries--except South Vietnam, where they can choose between English and French--are required to study English. In Thai and Indonesian universities many technical courses are taught in English, and the textbooks for such courses are in English, so that the student whose English is inadequate is greatly handicapped.

As to teacher training, in Formosa and Indonesia it can begin as early as the junior high school level, but language teachers usually begin their specialized training at the college level. Thailand and South Vietnam have programs more nearly like the American teacher-training programs; that is, beginning at the college level. Chulalongkorn University in Bangkok now offers a few gifted students the opportunity to take a Master's Degree in teaching English as a second language.

Thanks to the widespread interest in linguistics in Indonesia, Thailand, South Vietnam, Formosa, and other Asian countries, Ministries of Education have begun to give their blessings to the linguistic approach to language teaching and are stressing in-service teacher training as well as the improvement of pre-service training. The training of English teachers in Thailand and Indonesia is quite thorough as far as theory is concerned, and great strides are being made on the practical level also. South Vietnam had a good start in the training of English teachers when the Southeast Asian Regional English Project left there in 1963. We left 50 to 60 well-trained English teachers, some of whom have been able to continue their studies in English-speaking countries. I hope, after the political and military situation there is resolved, that they will be able to continue the good work. One of the teachers there who had his Master's Degree in linguistics from the University of Michigan is now about to receive his Ph.D. in linguistics from a university in Australia.

Thailand and Indonesia now provide excellent training for English teachers in their own teacher-training institutions. In both countries there are several persons with Ph.D.'s from such institutions as Indiana, Columbia, Michigan, and California, who are now training teachers of English. In both countries there are many persons who hold master's degrees in linguistics from American universities working in the provinces. Through in-service and pre-service courses, even the secondary school teachers are now quite familiar with the concepts of phonemes, allophones, morphemes, pattern practice drills of various types, transformations, and the nature of language in general.

The Peace Corps, the binational centers, and the British Council programs have also helped to improve English instruction in these Asian countries. Both the Bi-national centers and the British Council give proficiency examinations which help to improve standards. So, thanks to the real desire on the part of Asians to improve their English teaching, tremendous strides have been made in the past ten years. In 1963, after the Southeast Asian Regional English Project had been in operation for five years in Thailand, South Vietnam, and Laos, holding as many in-service courses and seminars as it possibly could, I found I could walk down the streets of a village and meet children of 12 or 13 who could carry on a short intelligent conversation in English. The bolder 15- and 16-year-old students could talk considerably longer, and in a few cases I was entertained in their homes for an hour or more, with all the conversation in English.

In conclusion, I would say that the organization of the educational systems in the Asian countries I have been able to observe is not strikingly different from our own, except that authority is vested in the Ministries of Education rather than in the local school organizations. As for the study of foreign language, it seems to me that it is taken much more seriously there than is the general rule in our own schools. Teacher training in English has made great advances.

What bearing does all this have on us as ESL teachers? All statistics indicate that more and more foreign students will be coming to this country to study, and that the demand for ESL teachers to go overseas will increase. Because of the improvement in language instruction in the Asian countries, I anticipate that a larger percentage of them will be able to use English well enough to take special English composition courses rather than proficiency courses on the undergraduate level, and that students on the graduate level will more and more be able to go directly into graduate work here. But because of the large number of students coming I believe there will still be need for proficiency courses in our colleges and universities for a long time to come.

As to the training of TESL teachers in our colleges and universities, I believe anyone preparing to teach in one of the four countries I have mentioned most in this paper--Indonesia, Thailand, South Vietnam, and Formosa--will need to have a good understanding of modern linguistics in order to gain and hold the respect of his fellow English teachers in those countries. And if he goes as an English language expert, he will need a thorough grounding in all types of linguistic theory and be an effective, practicing teacher as well. Otherwise, he might find himself in the role of a novice advising the expert.

TRANSFORMATIONAL GRAMMAR AND CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

Paul Schachter, University of California, Los Angeles

The purpose of this paper is to examine briefly the implications of some recent developments in the theory of transformational generative grammar for the contrastive analysis of languages. By contrastive analysis I mean the analysis of the similarities and differences between two or more languages. The value of such analysis to the foreign-language teacher, including the teacher of English as a second language, has long been recognized. This value stems from the fact that students tend to transfer the features of their native language to the language they are learning. From this it follows that features of the foreign language that are similar to features of the native language will present little difficulty, while features of the foreign language that are different from those of the native language will require some amount of attention on the teacher's part. A contrastive analysis, by specifying just which features the two languages have in common and which they do not, can thus alert the teacher to what, in the foreign language, really needs to be taught.

Until fairly recently, structural linguists have tended to emphasize the respects in which languages differ from one another. This emphasis upon the idiosyncratic characteristics of languages originated in an essentially healthy rejection of an earlier grammatical tradition in which it had been assumed that all languages were more or less reasonable facsimiles of Latin, and could be analyzed in terms of Latin-like case systems, Latin-like verbal conjugations, etc. Reacting to this obviously incorrect assumption, twentieth-century linguists proposed--to quote one of them--"that languages could differ from each other without limit and in unpredictable ways." [Martin Joos, Readings in Linguistics, p. 96]

But it has recently been suggested that this reaction was something of an over-reaction, in which one incorrect assumption was replaced by another. And the experience of those who have successfully taught English to students with a wide variety of language backgrounds would seem to confirm that this is the case. For if it were true that the native languages of some of these students were limitlessly different from English, how could we explain the fact that the students do after all learn English when they have really been taught rather little? That is, when we consider the enormous complexity of English, and, indeed, of languages in general, and the relatively short time that it takes to learn such a complex system, mustn't we conclude that much of what the student knows when he has learned a new language he has not been taught at all? Must it not, rather, be the case that, for example, the Japanese student of English already knows, in a sense, a good deal of the structure of English before he has heard or uttered his first English word, that the mastery one has of the structure of one's native language automatically involves mastery of a substantial part of the structure of any other language?

Now I have perhaps been a little unfair to those linguists who have claimed that languages could differ from one another without limit; for these linguists would probably not claim that there are any two languages whose grammatical systems have absolutely nothing in common. They would, however, certainly claim that there is no reason to expect that two unrelated languages should share any particular set of grammatical or other features, so that they would not, for example, expect to find any substantial overlap between the grammatical features shared by Japanese and English, on the one hand, and those shared by, say, Chinese and English on the other. And it is just this claim that has lately been challenged by Noam Chomsky and others concerned with developing the theory of transformational generative grammar.

In his most recent book, Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, Chomsky proposes certain major revisions in the theory of transformational grammar. Of particular interest here is the distinction Chomsky now makes between "deep structure" and "surface structure." According to Chomsky, all sentences have both a deep structure and a surface structure. The deep structure is specified by a set of "base rules," and includes all of the syntactic features--constituency relations and so forth--that are relevant to the meaning of sentences. The surface structure of sentences results from the operation of another set of rules, the "transformational rules," upon deep structures, and includes all of the syntactic features--order relations, and so forth--that are relevant to the way sentences are pronounced.

Now Chomsky has suggested that a substantial part of the base rules of the grammar of any language may not be specific to that language, but may, instead, be rules of human language in general. This is not at all to deny the obviously considerable differences between languages that may be found in even the simplest types of sentences, but it is, rather, to account for these differences on the basis of the effect of diverse sets of transformational rules operating upon essentially similar deep structures. To quote Chomsky on this subject:

> It is commonly held that modern linguistic and anthropological investigations have conclusively refuted the doctrines of classical universal grammar, but this claim seems to me very much exaggerated. Modern work has, indeed, shown a great diversity in the surface structures of languages. However, since the study of deep structures has not been its concern, it has not attempted to show a corresponding diversity of underlying structures, and, in fact, the evidence that has been accumulated in modern study of language does not appear to suggest anything of this sort. [*Aspects*, p. 118]

Obviously, the claim that languages are highly similar in their deep structures, if true, has important implications for the contrastive analysis of grammatical systems. For it means, in effect, that the contrastive analyst can concentrate most of his attention upon the transformational rules of the languages he is comparing, investigating the ways in which these rules operate to change similar deep structures into possibly very different surface structures.

But Chomsky's current model of transformational grammar goes beyond this in its potential for simplifying the task of the contrastive analyst. For not only does the model direct the analyst's attention primarily to the comparison of transformational rules, but it even tells him, in many cases, just what transformational rules to compare. In this connection, it is important to note that, in the new model of transformational grammar (as opposed to the original one), transformational rules are, in general, obligatory; that is, the deep structures specified by the base rules, in general, *must* undergo transformation. Now from the hypothesis of the non-language-specificity or universality of base rules it follows that if, in any one language, there is a certain deep structure that must undergo transformation, there will be corresponding deep structures in other languages that must also undergo transformation. In such cases, then, the contrastive analyst knows precisely which transformational rules to compare: namely, those rules that apply to the corresponding deep structures in the several languages.

I would like to turn now to a case in point: a programatic contrastive analysis of relative clauses in English and some languages unrelated to it and to one another. In the sketch of the grammar of English that he provides in Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, Chomsky proposes that all English relative clauses represent transformations of deep-structure sentences: specifically, sentences that are part of--or, more precisely, are embedded in--noun phrases. That is, the base rules of English include a rule to the effect that a noun phrase may consist (among other things) of a noun plus a sentence, and the transformational rules of English include rules that, under certain specified circumstances, transform a sentence that is part of a noun phrase into a relative clause. Thus the base rules might specify a noun phrase that includes the noun people and the sentence I saw people, and the transformational rules might operate to transform this into the noun-plus-relative-clause structure, people whom I saw.

Let us assume--as, I think, we have some reason to--that relative clauses in all languages represent transformations of deep structure sentences that are embedded in noun phrases. Let us assume, in other words, that the English base rule that specifies that a noun phrase may consist of a noun plus a sentence is, in fact, not a rule specific to English, but, instead, a rule of human language in general. Our task as contrastive analysts then becomes that of comparing the transformational rules that operate, in the languages in which we are interested, to convert deep structures consisting of noun plus sentence (as parts of a noun phrase) into surface structures consisting of noun plus relative clause.

Transformational rules have two parts: a structural description and a structural change. The structural description specifies the domain or scope of the transformation: that is, the structures to which it applies. The structural change specifies the form of the transformation: that is, the ways in which the transformed structures differ from the structures specified in the structural description. In comparing the relative-clause transformations of two or more languages, then, differences in the structural descriptions will correspond to differences in the scope of relativization in the languages--that is, differences in the types of deep structures that can be relativized. Differences in the structural changes, on the other hand, will correspond to differences in the surface structures of the relative-clause constructions themselves.

If we compare the structural descriptions of the transformational rules of relativization in English and Tagalog (a Malayo-Polynesian language of the Philippines), we find that they have both striking similarities and striking differences. In both languages, of course, we find that the structural description specifies certain noun-phrase structures that include a noun (which we shall hereafter call the head noun) and a sentence (which we shall hereafter call the embedded sentence). In both, furthermore, we find that the structural description specifies that the embedded sentence must include a noun that is identical with the head noun (which we shall call the identical noun). To take an English example, a deep-structure noun phrase with the head noun people and the embedded sentence I saw people is relativizable. But if the base rules should produce a deep-structure noun phrase with the head noun people and the embedded sentence I saw animals or John loves Mary, relativization transformations fail to operate, and no surface structure, and hence no pronounceable utterance, results. Tagalog relativization transformations--and, presumably, those of all other languages--include a similar restriction. There are, in addition, certain other shared restrictions on the structure of the embedded sentence: it may not be a question; it may not be an imperative; and so on.

The most important difference between the structural descriptions of English and Tagalog relativization rules has to do with restrictions upon the syntactic role of the identical noun within the embedded sentence. English, in general, does not impose restrictions. The identical noun may be the object, as in the deep structure underlying *people whom I saw*, the subject, as in *the flowers which are on the table*, a prepositional object, as in *the table which the flowers are on*, etc. In Tagalog, on the other hand, the identical noun--with a few minor exceptions--always has the same syntactic role within the embedded sentence, that of *topic*. The Tagalog topic has no precise counterpart in the grammar of English. It will be sufficient for present purposes to say that in simple sentences of Tagalog there is in general only one topic, that this topic has certain distinguishing formal characteristics in the surface structure (e.g., if it is a common noun, it is preceded by the function word *ang*), and that in some cases (but by no means always, or even generally) it corresponds to the subject in English.

The most important point to be noted, with respect to relativization transformations, is that Tagalog simple sentences generally include only one noun functioning as topic and that only this noun may serve as the identical noun specified in the structural description of the relativization transformation. Thus in the Tagalog equivalent of the embedded sentence *The flowers are on the table* (*Nasa mesa ang bulaklak*), the noun *bulaklak* 'flowers' is the topic and so may serve as the identical noun for purposes of relativization, but the noun *mesa* 'table' is not the topic, and may not serve as the identical noun. That is, if there is a deep-structure noun phrase consisting of the noun *bulaklak* 'flowers' and the embedded sentence *Nasa mesa ang bulaklak* 'The flowers are on the table,' the relativization transformation operates to produce the noun-plus-relative-clause construction *bulaklak na nasa mesa* '[the] flowers which are on the table.' But if there is a deep-structure noun phrase consisting of the noun *mesa* 'table' and this same embedded sentence, the conditions imposed in the structural description of the relative-clause transformation are not met, and no noun-plus-relative-clause transformation can result. This is, then, to say that Tagalog has no structure precisely paralleling the structure of English *the table which the flowers are on* or *the table on which the flowers are*. (Tagalog can, of course, express the approximate *semantic* equivalent of these English structures. This it does with the structure *mesang may bulaklak*, literally, 'table having flowers.' This structure results from application of the relativization transformation to a deep-structure noun phrase consisting of the noun *mesa* and the embedded sentence *May bulaklak any mesa* 'The table has flowers.' Note that in this embedded sentence *mesa* is the topic, so that the conditions for relativization are met.)

This, then, is one example (out of many that might have been chosen) of differences in the scope of relativization in different languages that would, in a transformational generative grammar of these languages, be expressed by differences in the structural descriptions of transformational rules. Let us turn now to differences in the form of relativization in different languages, differences which, in generative grammars, would be expressed by differences in the structural changes of transformational rules.

In every case, the structural changes involved in relativization are designed to convert deep structures in which there is a noun phrase that includes a head noun and an embedded sentence into surface structures that include a head noun and a relative clause. In general, then, the function of the structural changes is to transform a sentence into a relative clause, and there are certain types of changes that one can reasonably expect to find in the relativization transformations of all languages. In the first place one can expect some kind of *linking*; that is, some kind of explicit marking of the fact that the clause is syntactically connected to the head noun. Secondly, one can expect some kind of *alteration of the identical noun*; that is, alteration of the noun within the embedded sentence that is identical with the head noun. (This alteration is to be expected because languages tend to be economical, and it would be obviously uneconomical simply to have a repetition of the head noun within the relative clause.) Finally, one may encounter various other changes that can be grouped together under the rubric *other subordinating devices*.

Comparing the structural changes involved in the relative clause transformations of English, Tagalog, and two African languages unrelated to one another, Twi (a Niger-Congo language of Ghana) and Hausa (an Afro-Asiatic language of Nigeria), we find that all do, in fact, involve linking and alteration of the identical noun. In the case of all four languages, linking is accomplished by the insertion of a linking element at or near the beginning of the relative clause. In English this element is the *wh-* of *who*, *whom*, or *which*; in Tagalog it has the form *-ng* or *na*; in Twi it is *a* and in Hausa *da*. Except for the fact that the linking element is in some cases just part of a word (English *wh-* or Tagalog *-ng*) while in others it is a more-or-less independent word (as in Twi and Hausa), all four languages are substantially similar with respect to the way in which they achieve linking.

Alteration of the identical noun shows more diversity. In Twi the identical noun is replaced by its personal-pronoun counterpart. Thus the Twi equivalent of *people whom I saw* may be literally glossed 'people-linker-I saw them.' In Tagalog, on the other hand, the identical noun is deleted, so that the Tagalog equivalent of *people whom I saw* may be glossed 'people-linker-I saw.' Hausa shows deletion of the identical noun in some cases, pronominalization of it in others, and in still others allows either deletion or pronominalization. Thus Hausa has two freely alternating equivalents of *people whom I saw*, which may be glossed, respectively, as 'people-linker-I saw' and 'people-linker-I saw them.' English is like Twi in using pronominalization consistently, but whereas Twi replaces the identical noun with an appropriate personal pronoun, English uses a special set of forms, the relative pronouns, in which the pronominal replacement of the identical noun is combined with the linking element *wh-*.

It is with respect to the use of other subordinating devices that the four languages being examined show the most idiosyncratic characteristics. In English we have the front-shifting of the pronominal replacement of the identical noun: i.e., the occurrence of the relative pronoun at or near the beginning of the relative clause, regardless of its syntactic role within this clause. There is nothing at all like this in any of the other languages. Twi and Hausa also have subordinating devices without counterparts in the other langues: in Twi, the use of a special set of tone patterns that occur only in subordinate structures; in Hausa, the use of a special set of verb tense markers that occur only in subordinate structures. Tagalog differs from all of the others in that, apart from linking and deletion of the identical noun, no other subordinating devices are used at all.

These then, are some examples of similarities and differences involved in the forms of relative-clause structures in different languages. Formal differences of the kind that have been mentioned would, in generative grammars of these languages, be expressed as differences in the structural-change portion of pertinent transformational rules. I believe that, were the structural-changes-of-relativization rules in these languages compared in a more formal way than I have attempted to do, the comparison would provide a very clear statement of just what the major formal differences among the relative-clause structures of the languages we have been considering are. Similarly, I think that a very clear statement of differences in the scope of relativization would emerge from a formal comparison of the structural descriptions of relative-clause transformations in these languages. I hope, at any rate, that enough has been said to demonstrate that it is worthwhile to try to make such statements, and that they may be of considerable interest to languge teachers.

A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF SEGMENTS OF TRANSFORMATIONAL GRAMMARS OF ENGLISH AND TAGALOG

Robert D. Wilson, University of California at Los Angeles

The particular area of syntax which I shall cover is that of relative clauses.

Traditional grammars of English name two types of relative clauses, the restrictive and the nonrestrictive. Two examples which are often used to distinguish the restrictive from the non-restrictive are the following:

1. My wife, who works in Los Angeles, is arriving tomorrow. (NR)
2. My wife who works in Los Angeles is arriving tomorrow. (R)

The surface structure of a sentence with a restrictive relative clause places the relative clause and its head under the roof of a single intonation phrase. On the other hand, the surface structure of a sentence with a nonrestrictive relative clause places the relative clause under the roof of an intonation phrase separate from that of its head, the separation being effected by a pause between the head and the clause.

The deep structure of a sentence with a restrictive relative clause includes in its representation an embedded #S# which is part of a noun phrase. Thus, in example 2, the segment which reads: "My wife who works in Los Angeles" is a segment classified as a noun phrase and, in this example, the subject of the sentence. On the other hand, the deep structure of a sentence with a nonrestrictive relative clause includes in its representation a coordinate #S# generated by the first rule of the phrase-structure subcomponent. Thus, example 1 is derived from the following:

3. My wife works in Los Angeles, and my wife is arriving tomorrow.

The arguments for these sources of the restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses are beyond the scope of this paper; they will appear in a forthcoming article by Professor Campbell and myself.

Tagalog, on the other hand, does not formally distinguish between restrictive and nonrestrictive relative clauses in any general way. Both examples 1 and 2 may be translated into the following:

4. Ang asawa kong nagtratrabaho sa Los Angeles ...
   Ang asawa/kp/-ng/nagtratrabaho/sa Los Angeles ...
   wife/my/who/works/in Los Angeles

The first and immediate reaction of some of my informants was to interpret the relative clause of example 4 as restrictive. Then it would quickly occur to them that the intention of the speaker of example 4 was not to convey that he had more than one wife, but rather that he had only one wife and that he was saying something about her parenthetically--which, of course, makes the interpretation nonrestrictive. They also explained that if they knew that the speaker had only one wife, their first interpretation would be restrictive. Other informants claimed that they were completely ambivalent about the ambiguity.

The ambiguity, however, is not there when the head noun is a proper name. In Tagalog, proper names are introduced by si when they occur as subjects of the sentence. Other nouns are introduced by ang. For example, si Oscar for "Oscar," but ang bata for "the child." Now, take the following example:

5. Si Oscar na nagtratrabaho sa Los Angeles ...
   Si Oscar/na/nagtratrabaho/sa Los Angeles ...
   Oscar/who/works/in Los Angeles

This is unambiguously interpreted as nonrestrictive. English, too, requires that the relative clause following a proper noun be nonrestrictive as in the following example:

6. Oscar, who works in Los Angeles ...

However, if the English proper noun is converted into a common noun by introducing it with the determiner the, its relative clause must be restrictive, as in the following example:

7. The Oscar who works in Los Angeles ...

The same change is possible in Tagalog. If the proper name is converted into a common noun by introducing it with ang instead of with si, its relative clause is interpreted as restrictive as in the following example:

8. Ang Oscar na nagtratrabaho sa Los Angeles ...
   Ang Oscar/na/nagtratrabaho/sa Los Angeles ...
   the Oscar/who/works/in Los Angeles ...

Remember that in example 4 the relative clause was interpreted as nonrestrictive when it was assumed that the speaker had only one wife. Observe that such an assumption of one wife makes the common noun wife semantically parallel to a proper name. It is not surprising then that the relative clause following a common noun considered like a proper name be a nonrestrictive relative clause; that is, just as a proper name is followed by a relative clause interpreted as nonrestrictive.

The surface structure of a Tagalog sentence with a relative clause does not formally distinguish between the two types of clauses when the head noun is a common noun. But it does make a distinction when the head noun is a proper noun. It does this with si or any of its alternants for nonrestrictives, and with ang or any or its alternants for restrictives.

The deep structure, if current requirements of transformational theory are to be met, should provide two different representations in order to provide for a syntactic account of the resulting ambiguity in the case of common nouns, and of the resulting surface distinction in the case of proper nouns. Such an accounting might take the following form: The relative clause will have only one source in the deep structure since, of itself, it does not provide a formal distinction for the two types of clauses. Its most natural source is an embedded #S# which is part of a noun phrase. The distinction lies in the head noun. It is to be introduced either by ang or si. A noun in the environment between ang and #S# may pick up either a common noun or a proper name from the lexicon. A noun in the environment between si and #S# may pick up either a proper name or a human common noun. A human common noun introduced by si is a metaphor where a characteristic stands for a particular person. For example:

9. Dadating bukas si abogado.
   Dadating/bukas/si abogado.
   will arrive/tomorrow/lawyer(="Oscar")

10. Dadating bukas si abogadong mataba.
    Dadating/bukas/si abogado/-ng/mataba.
    will arrive/tomorrow/lawyer(="Oscar")/who/is fat

11. Dadating bukas si (ma)taba.
Dadating/bukas/si (ma)taba.
will arrive/tomorrow/the fat one(="Oscar")

Tagalog, however, requires that the embedded #S# have a structure which is more restricted than that of English. In English, a noun of the embedded #S# must be identical to the head noun in the matrix #S#.

12. The child who ate the meat is drinking the milk.

13. The child is drinking the milk.

14. The child ate the meat.

Example 14 is the embedded #S# of example 12. Example 13 is the matrix #S# of example 12. The noun child of example 14 is identical to the head noun child of example 13. There is no requirement that the noun child of example 14 (the embedded #S#) have any particular function. For example, an equally possible embedded #S# would be the following:

15. I gave the meat to the child.

And this would generate the following:

16. The child whom I gave the meat to is drinking the milk.

On the other hand, Tagalog requires more than that a noun of the embedded #S# be identical to the head noun in the matrix #S#. It also requires that the identical noun in the embedded #S# have the grammatical function of subject. A better known and more descriptive term for subject in Tagalog is "focus." I shall use this term. Focus is marked by si or ang.

17. Umiinom nang gatas ang bata.
Umiinom/nang gatas/ang bata.
drinking/the milk/the child

"The child is drinking the milk."

18. Binigyan ko nang karne ang bata.
Binigyan/ko/nang karne/ang bata.
was given/by me/the meat/the child

"The child was given the meat by me."

19. Umiinom nang gatas ang batang binigyan ko nang karne.
Umiinom/nang gatas/ang bata/-ng/binigyan/ko/nang karne.
is drinking/the milk/the child/who/was given/by me/the meat

"The child who was given the meat by me is drinking the milk."

Example 18 is the embedded #S# of example 19. Example 17 is the matrix #S# of example 19. The noun bata of example 18 is identical to the noun bata of example 17.

Also, the identical noun *bata* of example 18 (the embedded #S#) is marked by *ang*. It marks the noun *bata* as the focus of the sentence. This is necessary if example 19 is to be generated.

If, instead of example 18, the embedded #S# were one in which *bata* is *not* the focus of the sentence, as in the following example,

20. Binigay ko sa bata ang karne.
Binigay/ko/sa bata/ang karne.
was given/ by me/to the child/the meat

"The meat was given to the child by me."

then the resulting sentence of example 19 could not be generated; indeed, no resulting sentence with a relativization of *bata* would be possible.

The consequences of relativization are different in the two languages. English relative clauses, whether restrictive or nonrestrictive, follow the head of the noun phrase. They are not allowed to precede it. The following example is ungrammatical:

21. "The who I gave the meat to the child is drinking the milk."

Tagalog restrictive relative clauses, on the other hand, may precede the head of the noun phrase. The following example is grammatical:

22. Umiinom nang gatas any binigyan ko nang karneng bata.

Umiinom/nang gatas/ang/binigyan/ko/nan karne/-ng/bata.
is drinking/the milk/the/was given/by me/the meat/who/child

"The child who was given the meat by me is drinking the milk."

Whether all nonrestrictive relative clauses or just some, and if some, which ones, may precede the head of the noun phrase is not clear at present.

Another consequence is that English relative clauses are introduced by relative pronouns: for example, *who*, *which*, and *that*. Their grammatical function is that of the noun they have replaced. To illustrate, the grammatical function of *who* in the sentence of example 16 is that of indirect object since it replaces *child* of the embedded #S# (example 15), where *child* is an indirect object. But the grammatical function of *who* in the sentence of example 2 is that of subject since it replaces *wife*, which is the subject of the embedded #S#.

On the other hand, what has appeared as the translation of *who* in the Tagalog example 19, namely, the bound morph*-ng* (a velar nasal), does not have the same grammatical function as the noun *bata* which has been deleted from the embedded #S# (example 18). To argue that it does will fail to explain the apparent occurrence of two focuses in a sentence like the following:

23. May mesang ginawa ang bata.
May/mesa/-ng/ginawa/ang bata.
There is/a table/which/was made/the child

"There is a table which the child made."

The function of the bound morph *-ng* is merely to connect the relative clause to its head. Observe that in example 19 it is bound to *bata* "child," while in example 22 it is bound to *karne* "meat." An alternate of *-ng* is an unbound *na*, which occurs in examples 5 and 8. These allomorphs occur according to certain restrictions dictated by phonologically conditioned morphophonemic rules.

The foregoing discussion is the sort of contrastive analysis which is possible with transformational theory as a frame of reference. I hope it proves useful.

LANGUAGE LESSONS BASED ON TRANSFORMATIONAL ANALYSIS

Lois McIntosh, University of California at Los Angeles

The teacher of English as a second language who has kept up with all the developments in language analysis and comparison in recent years finds his work both complicated and simplified. It is complicated because we are learning more and more about the English language, not only about its surface structure but about its deep grammar. Empirically derived insights, so long the resource of the language teacher lacking training in linguistics, have yielded to increasingly exact formulations of the generation of sentences in English itself and also in English as contrasted with other languages.

On the other hand our task is simplified because we can derive from phrase markers, phrase structure rules and transformational rules; information that can be adapted, though not completely, to classroom procedures.

The language teacher must be able to understand and draw on the analytic descriptions and contrastive studies of English and the language of the learners of English. But he must also be a teacher of language, and where there is a conflict between strict following of a linguistic formulation and the language needs of the learner, the latter must take preference with us.

In arranging a series of lessons in the English Language, the demands of English structure will undoubtedly dominate the sequence. For example, we would not introduce restrictive relative clauses before we had taught the basic or kernel sentences from which such clauses derive. But within a given structure--such as the relative clause--we will organize and emphasize our details according to the information we have from the first language of the learner. We will proceed differently in presenting the teaching problems of relative clauses to a speaker of French or Spanish than we will to a speaker of Tagalog. This will be illustrated in the lesson material. When relative clauses are taught against the background of a similar structure in Tagalog, at least six and probably eight different problems arise and must be sequenced with attention to the structural contrasts of Tagalog.

We have just heard from Mr. Wilson that the modification by relative clause is limited to the *ang* marked feature of the constituent sentence. The word in actor focus, the *topic*, marked by *ang* permits a construction that can be more or less equated with relative clause modification in English. The device for embedding is not the same. Where English retains in the relative pronouns *who/which* the function of the nouns they replace, Tagalog does not, as we have *already* seen. The relative pronouns will be new. The retained function will be new. The forms for human versus non-human will be new.

However, the *ang* marked topic is sometimes translated as *the plus noun* functioning as subject. This surface resemblance suggests a point of departure: We begin with sentences of the noun subject-intransitive verb pattern, and we introduce *who/which* clauses as modifiers of the noun subject. This postpones involvement *with two* sentences that have no close counterpart in Tagalog--the transitive verb-object sentence and the sentence with *be*. We postpone *be* for a number of reasons. Tagalog has no such verb: Although the matters *of* form and concord will have been handled in basic sentences with *be*, introduced at this point they will compound the learning problem. Also, relative clauses with *be* may, by deletion, result in appositives, adjuctive modifiers, and locative-adverbial modifiers--all structures to be acquired after we have coped with the relative clause construction in other ways.

We begin the lesson, then, with sentences with intransitive verbs, and with relative clauses as modifiers of the subject of the intransitive verb. However, we cannot stay with these sentences very long. The range of intransitive verbs that fit into a given context is somewhat limited. We will next move on to other sentence types--for we must show that the relative clause is not limited to modification of the subject--with objects of all kinds which may be so modified. We have also moved on because it would not be productive for the learner to manipulate a long list of random sentences simply because the verbs in them can be considered intransitive.

In short, we stay with the needs revealed by contrastive study as long as we can. But if the language of the lesson becomes forced, if the examples and the practice sentences are not productive, we turn away from analysis and focus on usable forms of English.

In this respect let me urge all makers of language lessons to avoid certain sins. No matter how closely you control the utterance, no matter how tightly manipulative the drill, be sure that the learners are making sense. Drills that begin with a pronoun--*he* or *she* with no referent and no context should be avoided. *John* and *Mary*, unidentified and uninteresting, work overtime in drill *sentences*. Questions to which contradictory answers are expected should be eliminated from all language drills:

Are you a student?   Yes, I am.
No, I'm not.

There is no need to make liars out of our students. In short, language lessons must keep the learner in mind. They must offer him language he can use meaningfully. When he is asked to repeat sentences, those sentences should be worth repeating. Find a context for a lessons, and exploit it.

Having said all this I offer this lesson for Tagalog speakers learning English. The one activity or techneme is that of joining a constituent sentence to a matrix by means of a relative clause. Control is established by positioning the matrix on the left. Manipulation of the material yields to communication by degrees.

We begin with a structure similar to one in Tagalog, but as we go deeper into the problems of the English relative clause construction, we go farther away from their first language. The lesson spells out only two teaching problems: who/which clauses as modifiers of the noun subject of intransitive verb statements, and who/which clauses modifiers of any noun phrases in the sentence. The possibility of that as a substitute for who or which is not brought in at this time. The particle nga in Tagalog is frequently translated as that and we wish to prevent any association that will tend to equate the Tagalog construction with the very different one in English.

A complete lesson is needed for the next step. Time and space prevent giving it here--but the relative clause derived from the object of the constituent sentence presents several problems:

Noun whom   Noun Verb
which
that

(The man to whom I spoke; the man that I spoke to; the man I spoke to)
(The book which I read: the book that I read; the book I read).
All these result from this construction and need step by step presentation. Into this lesson must go considerations of style level too. It is not productive to have the student produce sentences without some sense of how and where they are to be used: the contrast of the man to whom I spoke and the man I spoke to needs some comment and practice.

A separate lesson for the relative clause introduced by whose is indicated. Here the problem is compounded by both languages. Tagalog can't do it. It can have: "The man has a book on the table"--but not: "The man whose book is on the table." When it comes to constructing oral drills in English, we may get some very peculiar ones:

This is the man. You know his wife.
This is the man whose wife you know.

However, if we take examples such as these from a light-hearted essay in The New Yorker for April 16th, and if we center the lesson around a style of writing, we may be nearer its productive use:

..... whole types and classes of humanity whose existence might otherwise be unsuspected

..... That there are people...whose great need in life is.....

..... The class of gentry for whose benefit.....

Clearly, our lesson on this clause will have to be shaped and emphasized differently. Related to whose are the of which constructions. Clauses of the place where and the time when variety should follow those of the which/whom/that. Relative clauses with be as the verb will yield--by deletion--appositives, locative post modifiers [the man outside], and adjective modifiers.

At the very end of the scale I would place non-restrictive clauses. The native speaker wrestles with this problem--struggling to put commas in or leave them out. Guided by pauses, intonation, and general meaning, he manages to make sense of this. To the foreign student the clauses look and sound alike. The non-restrictive clause probably derived from a co-ordinate rather than a dependent sentence, but that has not yet been fully described. The restrictive relative clause as modifier of the noun is productive and valuable and, of itself, offers many problems to be worked out in lessons.

The terminology in the lesson is for the student. There is no attempt to involve him in the vocabulary of generative-transformational procedures, even though he is going through the processes described by that analysis.

To sum up: The language teacher looks to language analysis and contrastive studies for reliable information to replace guess work. He finds much to shape the procedures of his lessons by turning to these sources. He also continues to teach language to the learner, in terms by which the learner may profit.

Restrictive Relative Clauses

AIMS: To introduce restrictive relative clauses as modifiers of nouns in English to adult speakers of Tagalog, who have had several years of English.
To sequence the presentation on the basis of a contrastive study of the form and scope of this structure in English and Tagalog.
To present the material of this lesson in spoken and written American English that will be suitable to the age and interests of adult college students and useful for their further control of the language.

PROCEDURES:

1. A brief conversational exchange serves to introduce examples of a sentence in which the noun phrase is subject of an intransitive verb, and the relative clause is modifier of the subject.
2. After hearing the conversation, the class will repeat it after the teacher, once or twice. This is not material to be dwelt on and internalized. It serves merely to introduce the subject under discussion and set the context for the drills that follow.
3. Questions will elicit the structure to be introduced and lead into a comment or generalization that will focus attention on the structure and prepare the class for the practice that follows.
4. The drills include (a) embedding the second or constituent sentence of a pair with identical subjects into the first or matrix sentence and (b) completion of sentences by embedding clauses from furnished clues.

Steps One to Four in the lesson

One: Listen to this conversation:

A. What kind of girls go to this university?

B. What a question! All kinds of girls: Girls who study hard, girls who never study, girls who dance well, girls who dress well, girls who speak to you, girls who don't speak to you--they all go to this university.

A. That's enough. I'd like to meet just one of those girls.

Two: Repeat the conversation after me.

Three: Answer these questions:	(Expected response)
1. Do girls go to this university?	(yes, they do)
2. Do girls who study go to this university?	(yes, they do)
3. What other girls go?	(class lists the others until all sentences with WHO clauses have been produced)

Look at these sentences:

Girls go to the university. Are the subjects the same? (yes)
Girls study.

Substitute WHO for GIRLS in the second sentence: WHO STUDY

Add it to the first sentence immediately after the subject:

GIRLS WHO STUDY GO TO THE UNIVERSITY

[When the subjects in two basic sentences are the same, the second sentence can be added to the first by changing the noun subject to WHO and adding this relative clause immediately after the subject.]

Four: (a) Combine the following sets in the same way. Add each clause to sentence one:

1. Girls go to the university.

1.1 Girls never study
1.2 Girls dance
1.3 Girls dress well
1.4 Girls speak to you
1.5 Girls don't speak to you

Four: (b) Make single sentences of the information in these two columns, by making WHO clauses of the sentences in the second column. Be sure that you add the WHO clause to a sentence where it will make sense:

(1)

a. Girls make poor grades
b. Girls make the dean's list
c. Girls have many friends
d. Girls spend lots of money
e. Girls don't make friends

(2)

Girls dance well
Girls dress well
Girls study hard
Girls don't study
Girls speak to you
Girls don't speak to you

Four: (c) What about the boys at this university? Can you fit them into six sentences like those above? Change all the subjects from GIRLS to BOYS and try to combine the sentences.

Example: Boys who dance well have many friends.

PROCEDURES: continued

5. Clauses introduced by WHICH are introduced next. Notice that even in the first set of drills the intransitive verb sentence was not the only kind

used in the drill. The next examples include other sentence types. The clause structure is still limited to WHO/WHICH in subject position, and the modification is still limited to the noun phrase subject of the matrix sentence.

Five: Notice these sentences:

There are classes WHICH meet three times a week.
The classes WHICH meet every day carry more credit.
Graduate seminars WHICH meet for several hours once a week are less usual.

[When the subject of a sentence refers to anything except people, the relative pronoun replacing the subject is WHICH instead of WHO.]

Five: (a) Combine these pairs of sentences into a single sentence containing a WHICH clause.

Example: Classes carry more credit. Classes meet every day.
Classes WHICH meet every day carry more credit.

1. A library can serve the entire university.
1.1 A library has several branches
1.2 A library has thousands of books
1.3 A library has a large staff
1.4 A library has comfortable reading rooms
1.5 A library has a good reference department

Five: (b) Combine the information in columns one and two, by making WHICH clauses of the sentences in the second column. Be sure that the resulting sentences make sense.

(1)

Classes are well attended

Classes are not popular

Classes annoy some students

Classes attract some students

(2)

Classes meet every day
Classes have good lecturers
Classes require student discussion
Classes are limited to fifteen students
Classes have several hundred students
Classes have daily quizzes
Classes start on time
Classes don't start on time

Five: (c) Combine these sentences in the same way, using WHO or WHICH to introduce the relative clause, as required:

Boys and girls attend the University
The classes interest them

The professors do not admire these students
Hard work appeals to some students

They only want to make friends
The classes don't require much work
The professors respect hard work
Hard work results in good grades

PROCEDURES: continued

6. We move on to introduce relative clauses as modifiers of noun phrases functioning as objects--direct, indirect, and as heads of prepositional phrases.

Six: Listen to this conversation:

A. What happened to that girl who took chemistry with us last semester?
B. She flunked the two courses which were required for graduation.
Now she's at a school which has easier requirements.

Six: (a) Find the clauses introduced by WHO and WHICH.
Is GIRL the subject of the first sentence?
Is it object of the verb? of a preposition?
Is TWO COURSES subject or object of the verb?
What is the function of SCHOOL in AT A SCHOOL?

These examples show that English permits a relative clause as modifier of any noun phrase in the sentence. The clauses are not limited to modifying the subject.

Six: (b) Combine these sentences by adding a WHO or WHICH clause to the first sentence of each pair.

1.	I spoke to the man.	The man was waiting for class to begin.
	I noticed the student.	The student was taking notes.
	I watched the girl.	The girl was copying the student's notes.
	I saw the notes.	The notes were not accurate.
2.	Boys admire girls.	Add five clauses describing the kinds of girls boys admire.
3.	Students prefer classes.	Make clauses describing your preference in classes.
4.	Students like professors.	Make clauses of your own preferences.

ASSIGNMENT for Part One:

Describe the following subjects and people using clauses introduced by WHO or WHICH.

Example: Linguists are men who study languages.
Chemistry is the science which treats substances and their transformations.

A	B
Mathematics	Musicians
Physics	Artists
Botany	Writers
Biology	Statesmen
Geology	Politicians

Add five more subjects to Part A and five more people to Part B and describe them in similar sentences.

SOCIOLINGUISTICS FOR TEACHERS OF ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES

Charles A. Ferguson, Center for Applied Linguistics

Sociolinguistics is another hypenated variety of linguistics which is becoming fashionable. The word is beginning to appear in various publications, and courses are now being given in sociolinguistics, so I think it is perhaps reasonable that we try to see what relevance, if any, this new brand of linguistics has for the teaching of English as a second or foreign language, and what interest TESL or TEFL has for people who are primarily concerned with sociolinguistics. In this NAFSA group, I think it will be more useful for me to try to explain what I think sociolinguistics is about, rather than what I think the teaching of English as a second or foreign language is about.

It has been widely accepted among practitioners in the TEFL field that linguistics as such, narrowly-defined and "unhyphenated," has implications for the profession. I suppose one important matter has been simply the description of the English language, in order to know how to sequence materials, how to prepare materials, how to plan classroom techniques, and so on. Another important matter for some years has been the use of contrastive studies, in which the structure of the language of the learner is compared with the structure of the English language, so that one may find points of difference and similarities, again in order to assist in the planning of instructional materials, classroom teachniques, and so on.

Linguistics proper has been concerned with the structure of particular languages, such as English or the learner's native language, and linguistic structure in general. Sociolinguistics has a much broader sweep and seems to cover all kinds of topics that are quite far from linguistic structure as such. I won't attempt to offer a definition of sociolinguistics here because I've spent many weary hours with fellow practitioners trying to arrive at a definition, and there seem to be sharp disagreements as to what the definition should be We can, however, describe sociolinguistics by saying it is what people who call themselves sociolinguists do when they're behaving professionally, or something of that sort. Or, in fact, you might say, sociolinguistics is that field of inquiry which contains matters of legitimate professional interest both to linguists and to other social scientists.

If I were to illustrate the range of research and teaching going on in the field of sociolinguistics now, I could point to five major areas of concern. They are by no means exhaustive, in the sense that one could easily imagine other problems that would interest research workers, but I would like to list them. First, there is the matter of the relation between language and social stratification. Certainly this has been mentioned often in the past, but it hasn't been studied systematically and in depth until very recently. I am referring, for example, to such studies as those of Bill Labov in New York City. Some of you are already familiar with them, and I think those of you who are not familiar should become so. These are studies which show the correlation between linguistic markers of one sort or another and membership in social classes or other groups in the society. It is tempting to stop here and give some examples and illustrations of this work because of its ingenious research methods and rather spectacular results, but I think I prefer simply to go on to another area. Incidentally, a convenient place to turn for information on this is the N.C.T.E. booklet Social Dialect and Language Learning, [ed. Roger W. Shuy, Champaign, Illinois, 1965] which has in it a very nice paper by Labov as well as other papers in this field that you might find of interest.

Next, there is the question of multilingualism of various kinds. There have been studies on bilingualism now for a long time and there are thousands of items in the bibliography. One of the new points of view in this field comes from Joshua Fishman of Yeshiva University. He is concerned with why one particular language survives in a community and another doesn't. Why is it that when immigrant groups come to the United States, one group will persist in using its own language for some generations, while another group loses its native language almost overnight? This question of "language shift" and "language maintenance" (these are the terms that Fishman uses) is a very interesting question and one which has not been tackled before in any systematic way. I think its relevance to TESL hardly needs much discussion, particularly for adult immigrants in this country, or similar situations in other countries.

Another term that Fishman has used here is "domain." It is quite clear that there tend to be differences in the domains for which one language is appropriate and those to which another is appropriate. This is not true just for immigrants to American but is generally true of societies around the world. This question also hasn't been studied in any systematic way until very recently. Those of you who are interested in it could well look at the book that has just appeared in the last several weeks, *Language Loyalty in the United States*, written by Joshua Fishman [The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1966]. It is a very detailed study of language maintenance and shift in the United States based on a number of years of research on the part of Fishman and several of his associates and colleagues.

Another sociolinguistic problem which hasn't been looked at for a long time and which seems to me to be of relevance to TESL is the question of language standardization. We talk about the standard varieties of languages, but, until fairly recently, there have been very few studies to investigate how the process of standardization takes place. How does one particular variety of a language come to be accepted as standard? What kinds of mechanisms are there for assuring this process? I am tempted to say that even now we don't have any serious studies; they are just beginning. But, in the last two or three years, there have been several books and articles written on the subject, and courses on the process of language standardization are now being taught at several universities in this country. I think we can hope that in the next few years we will have a good bit of material available on this. The person whose name I've attached particularly to the study of language standardization is Einar Haugen at Harvard who has just published a book called *Language Conflict and Language Planning* [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, in publication] which is full of insights for people who are concerend with problems of standard language in general. The book uses the language situation of Norway as its subject matter, but it doesn't require any knowledge of Norwegian for an appreciation of the contents.

The next area that I would like to mention is that of characterizing or classifying sociolinguistic communities. If you look at a small village in some part of India or a small town in some part of a mid-western state in this country and compare the linguistic behavior in them, you will find a lot of differences besides the simple structural differences between the languages. In some speech communities it is normal, under certain circumstances, to shift from one dialect to another or from one language to another or even to mix languages. It is possible to imagine a kind of classification of sociolinguistic communities which would make it clear that certain types of communities use language in some ways and others in other ways. And this is directly relevant, for instance, to the question of how English is used in many parts of the world. I have associated the name of John Gumperz with this particular kind of study; he has published a comparative study of a little Norwegian village and a village in India in which he tried to analyze very carefully the respective roles of the different languages and dialects which form part of what he calls the "verbal repertoire" of the members of the community. ["Linguistic and Social Interaction in Two Communities," in The Ethnography of Communication, ed. John L. Gumperz and Dell Hymes (Amer. Anthropologist, Vol. 66, No. 6, Part 2, March 1964), pp. 137-53.]

And, finally, there is an area which has been called by Dell Hymes "The Ethnography of Speaking " [in Anthropology and Human Behavior, ed. Thomas Gladwin and William C. Sturtevant (Washington: The Anthropological Society of Washington, 1962), pp. 13-53.] This covers a whole range of activities including the ones that have already been mentioned. But, in particular, it is concerned with the attitudes of a particular speech community toward the language that they use, their attitude toward language in general, and their attitude toward the learning of language on the part of children. Societies vary enormously on this kind of thing. Some societies may pay a great deal of attention to accuracy in language, and other societies pay no attention to it at all. Some languages regard expressiveness on the part of users of the language as a thing of great importance and others disregard it, and so on. Strangely enough, anthropologists, who might have been expected to study this kind of phenomenon, have left it out of consideration almost completely. Monographs on village life or the culture of a particular society have offered a great blank in this particular area. Some anthropologists have done a marvelous job of describing the language in linguistic terms in a given community, but they have usually been fairly remiss in reporting under what circumstances which kinds of language are used or what people think about language and the use of language.

I think that is enough to give a notion of what is going on in the field of sociolinguistics today--what areas of research are perhaps most active. This is not the occasion to list the two or three anthologies that have come out in the last couple of years in this field, the one or two more in press, or even the one substantial new textbook in the field of sociology of language that has appeared. [The books alluded to but not mentioned are listed here for the convenience of the reader: William Bright, ed., Proceedings of U.C.L.A. Colloquium on Sociolinguistics (The Hague: Mouton & Co., in press); Joshua Fishman, Readings in the Sociology of Language (The Hague: Mouton & Co., in press); Joyce Hertzler, The Sociology of Language (New York: Random House, 1966); Dell Hymes, Language in Culture and Society; A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology (New York: Harper and Row, 1965).] But, let's try to think of what possible relevance all this sociolinguistic research has for TESL or TEFL. I would like to suggest at least two areas where the influences are from sociolinguistics to TESL and one, perhaps, the other way around.

First, there is the question of the use to which English is put in the country that the learner comes from. This is something that we haven't considered very much. A great deal of attention has been paid to contrastive linguistic analyses; for example, the structure of Bengali versus the structure of English and its interference problems. But we've rarely studied in detail how we can use in our TESL work information about the particular role that English plays and the circumstances under which English is used in a given society as contrasted with other societies. And, it at least seems likely that differences in final objectives would require quite different approaches--different curricula, materials, and classroom techniques. For example, countries in which English is not the native language tend to use English in one of three ways.

I am thinking, in the first place, of countries where English serves as what we might call the language of national unity. In a multilingual developing country where there is no dominant national language, English very often plays the role of the language of national unity. To the extent that the government of such a country is deliberately trying to unify the nation, by having an integrated set of values and norms that goes for the nation as a whole or by having a kind of symbolization of the aspirations of the nation, this must be done through the medium of English. When we think of English as serving that particular purpose before anything else, this means that English for such a country is not a vehicle of American culture or British culture or some other kind of Anglo-Saxon culture but primarily, in some sense, a vehicle of the national culture there. This puts a very special light on the kind of English teaching materials which would be most appropriate or most effective for achieving the objectives of the country. It raises another question too: In a country of this sort we may expect the development of a local standard variety of English, and we must cope with this in some way. We may wish to fight it to our last breath if we want to keep as models norms of English which are in use in countries where English is the native language. Or, we may want to go over wholeheartedly to the other side and say, "Yes, let's have the new variety of Nigerian English," or something of the sort. But, whatever attitude we take, there is a need to find out the facts and to cope with this essentially sociolinguistic problem.

The second kind of country is one where English is not the language of national unity but is the connecting link with the outside world and the means of access to science and technology; in general, to what we might call 20th century world communication. In this case, often, English must serve as the medium of instruction at secondary school and especially at the higher university level. Even if it is not the medium of instruction, it is a very important component in the educational system. And I think we all recognize this situation; many of us know cases of it, and are involved in it, but we've rarely tried to plan our courses in such a way that the English being taught was particularly aimed at the situation. What kind of English do these people need in order to have this kind of access to the rest of the world, as opposed to having a language for other purposes?

And, finally, the third kind of country is one where English is really a "foreign language," as meant by those who make the second language-foreign language dicotomy. I'm thinking of European countries, for example, where English is taught primarily to find out about the Anglo-Saxon world and the riches of the literature, whether teachnical or belletristic, existing in the English speaking world--here is the case where the materials are to be culturally weighed as much as possible because this is what is desired. We think of the teaching of French in our high school as being the kind of thing that is involved here--where we don't want to shy away from French culture, French literature, and so on; we want to find out about them. One would think that these three kinds of English teaching situations would call for very different methods. I am not suggesting that sociolinguistics has as yet shed any great wonderful light on this. So far this is pure common sense, and any of us could make this kind of classification without talking about sociolinguistics, but sociolinguistic research which is now being undertaken promises to provide a lot more information along these lines, information which the teachers of English to speakers of other languages may very well wish to use in all sorts of ways. We can even hope that the English teachers themselves will get involved in this kind of research and in the collection of data.

I said there were two points on which I would like to talk about the interest of sociolinguistics for TESL workers. The first was the use of English abroad; the second is the variety of native English. We have been generally concerned with the teaching of educated conversational English, if I am not mistaken. To be sure, we pay attention to other kinds of English to a certain extent: written English, at various levels, other styles, and so on. But the English language, as we all are aware, is a very complex instrument with many different style levels, different registers, and various social dialects. In many cases we want to prepare or should want to prepare our foreign learners to cope with a number of other kinds of English than the educated conversational variety. Whether or not we do, I think it is our responsibility to be aware of the nature and extent of dialect, register, and style variation within the English language so that our teaching materials and classroom techniques can take account of it.

Perhaps, in some cases, we not only want to teach a foreign student how to speak educated colloquial English of the American variety, but we might also want him to be able to understand and react in some way to regional dialects and to certain kinds of sub-standard English with which he is going to come into contact. He should be able to evaluate the differences, to some extent, throughout the English speaking world. And, here, I think we have to admit great ignorance ourselves. We raise issues sometimes--such as British versus American English--but most of us are very ill-informed on the different varieties of English that there are around the world in English speaking countries. In general, I find, for example, that even American dialect specialists know about American dialects but don't seem to know about British dialects or Australian ones. And, I think it is perfectly fair to say that I think British dialect specialists tend to know about British dialects and not about American dialects. So, here is a second issue about which we need a great deal more information that we can use in preparing materials and setting objectives in our training courses, and sociolinguistic research promises to provide something.

My final point is the other way around: What interest would a sociolinguistic group at this time have in the TESL field? I should think that for people with sociolinguistic interests it would form a very wonderful field of research: How does English language learning take place? Under what circumstances? This whole area of study is something that hasn't been really touched at all. It was pointed out by William Rayburn some years ago, I think quite correctly, that in general throughout the world bilingualism, that is the full mastery of at least one more language, is not normally achieved by formal education in school. Bilingualism is common throughout the world. Almost everywhere in the world there are people who speak two or more languages. But, this is almost always the result of some social need in the community where the other language has to be used rather than the result of learning the language in school. Of course, some people do learn the language in school, but even there, I think, it is very often not primarily learned in school. And, of course, we know the fact that many people study language for years in school and fail to achieve any kind of mastery. Well, I'm only mentioning this to point out that the whole process of second language acquisition is a mysterious one. We don't really know how it happens. We may, for example, know something about how you can use certain kinds of drill materials in a very limited kind of classroom context, but we also know that some people tend to pick up a language very rapidly under very different conditions where no one is offering them these drills. The person with sociolinguistics research interest, I think, would like to turn his attention to a careful analysis of how English learning takes place, not only in our public educational system where it is of obvious, immediate interest, but in the variety of circumstances under which other learning takes place, often much more effectively.

SOCIOLINGUISTIC ASPECTS OF TRANSLATION AND LANGUAGE TEACHING

J. C. Catford, University of Michigan

This title was suggested to me quite a long time ago, and I rashly accepted it. Until this moment I have been hard put to reconcile or conflate these three things in a systematic way. The result is that I am going to talk about translation rather more than anything else: about some sociolinguistic problems in relation to translation, and, to a small extent, about the relationship of these things to language teaching.

Language teachers have, I think, for long been prone to throwing out the baby with the bath water, and this is something which they did with translation. In the second half of the nineteenth century a number of language teachers in Europe, including some of the leading linguists of the time, such as Vietor, Jespersen, and Sweet, began to be dissatisfied with traditional methods of language teaching, and recommended the introduction of a number of "reforms" of various kinds. These included an emphasis on oral teaching, the application of the results of phonetic analysis to the teaching of pronunciation, and the use of a "phonemic" transcription--the term "phonemic" was not in general use at that time, but it is quite clear in the 1888 Constitution of the International Phonetic Association that phonemic transcription was being referred to. In addition, they supported the restricted and discriminating use of translation. Sweet, for example, in his 1898 Practical Study of Language, is clear on this. He points out the dangers inherent in using translation in language teaching, but at the same time he admits that it can be a valuable technique in certain circumstances. Many teachers, however, were for throwing out translation completely.

One cannot really begin to discuss the possible place of translation in language teaching without considering the nature of the transaltion process itself.

I have elsewhere defined translation as "the replacement of textual material in one language, the source language, by equivalent textual material in another language, the target." In using the term "textual material" rather than simply "text" I want to underline the rather obvious fact that in normal translation it is not the *totality* of the source text which is replaced by *equivalents* in the target language. Some aspects, or "levels," of the source text are simply replaced--by non-equivalent things. In other words, if I take a sentence like "What's the time?" and translate it into French as "Quelle heure est-il?" I replace the grammatical and lexical items of the source text by *equivalent* grammatical and lexical items in the target language: but I do not replace the *phonology* of the target text by anything which is equivalent. I merely replace the English phonology by a bit of French phonology which happens to be entailed by the selection of the particular French words that I use.

A more important point in this definition is that translation is said to involve replacement by *equivalents*. The question of translation-equivalence is obviously a central one. We have to distinguish between: (a) translation-equivalence as an *empirical phenomenon*, and (b) the underlying *conditions* of translation-equivalence. Secondly, we must distinguish between *translation-equivalence* and *formal correspondence* between items in languages.

A simple example will give an approximate idea of what I mean by these distinctions. Take, for instance, a French phrase like "mon pantalon" and its English translation-equivalent, "my trousers." Now, it is a fact that, in most situations, "my trousers" is an adequate translation-equivalent of "mon pantalon." That is just an *empirical fact*--something that you can observe. The justification, or the underlying *condition* for this equivalence is another thing; and in this case it is very obvious--namely, that both these phrases are relatable to the same extralinguistic object.

Formal correspondence can be illustrated in relation to this same example by the observation that English and French have formally corresponding number-systems: both have a two-term system (singular opposed to *plural*), and both systems may be said to be oriented in the same way, since in both it is the plural which would normally be regarded as the "marked" term. So, then, there is formal correspondence between the number-systems of English and French, and between the terms in the systems of the two languages. But if we now look again at the example I have just given, we find that in the translation-equivalence "mon pantalon"--"my trousers" it is the English *plural* which is, in this case, the equivalent of the French singular. This serves to underline the fact that formal correspondence is not the same thing as translation-equivalence.

Translation-equivalence, then, is an empirical phenomenon. It is what you observe when a bilingual person responds in the "same" way to the "same" situation in two different languages. For example, I was recently in Quebec--in a typical bilingual situation--and I was about to use the telephone. Finding I had no change I turned to a person standing by and said "Excuse me, do you have any change?" I saw that he did not understand, so switched to "Excusez" (which seems to be the usual Quebequois way of saying "Excusez-moi"), "avez-vous de la monnaie?" Now that is an example, an empirical example, of translation-equivalence. There are two texts, one in English and the other in French, and we call them translation equivalents because a bilingual person has used them both in, and with reference to, the same situation.

One of the failings of the older approach to language teaching was that it tended to confuse formal correspondence with translation-equivalence. For example, you can set up a certain formal correspondence between the *articles* in English and French: both have more or less corresponding definite, indefinite, partitive, and zero articles. The bad old tendency was to treat a formal correspondence of this type as if it implied translation-equivalence between corresponding terms, which, of course, is not necessarily the case.

Another aspect of translation which I would like to mention is the fact that translation-equivalence may occur between units at different places, different *ranks*, in a grammatical hierarchy, even when two languages have an approximately corresponding hierarchy of grammatical units. An example is English and French, for both of which one can set up a corresponding hierarchy: *sentence clause*, phrase or *group*, *word* and *morpheme*. In general, you can find a sentence which is the equivalent of a sentence in another language. But if you go down the rank-scale to word and morpheme, you find it more and more difficult to establish equivalences at these lower ranks. Such "lower-rank" equivalences do, of course, occur: for example in the English sentence "Where are my glasses?" and its French equivalent "Où sont mes lunettes?" you can find equivalences right down to word, and even morpheme, rank. But this is rather exceptional. Translation-equivalence commonly occurs at sentence rank, but rarely goes all the way down to the rank of word or morpheme.

Moreover, translation-equivalence is often *skewed*, in the sense that on any particular occasion the equivalent of a *word*, for instance, in the source text may be a *group*, or a *clause* or a particular type of *clause-structure*, or the like, in the target text. For example, here is an instance of a 'skewed' equivalence between English and Russian. Given the English sentence "The boy came into the room," a highly probable Russian equivalent would be "Malchik voshel v komnatu." Translated back word-for-word the Russian text reads "Boy entered into room." Now, if we change the English version from "*The* boy came into the room" to "*A* boy came into the room" there is a high probabilility that the Russian equivalent will be "V komnatu voshel malchik"--that is, "Into room entered boy." So here the translation-equivalent of a change of *words* in English (selection of a different term in the system of articles) is in Russian a change in the *structure of the clause*.

This kind of thing is very common in translation: one must not expect translation-equivalence always to be between items at the same grammatical rank in two languages. Here is one more example of the same type, this time from English and Scottish Gaelic. Take, for instance, the English affirmative sentence, "The man is in the boat"--a common situation in the Western Isles of Scotland. The Gaelic translation of this is "Tha an duine anns a' bhata": in a word-for-word back-translation that is "Is (affirmative) the man in the boat." Now, if I change the English text to "Is the man in the boat?" the Gaelic translation becomes "Am bheil an duine anns a' bhata": in a word-for-word back-translation, "Is (interrogative) the man in the boat?" Here, then, a change in the English clause-structure--a rearrangement of the elements of the clause--correlates with the selection of a different verb-form in Gaelic. That is to say, the Gaelic translation-equivalent of the English "interrogative" clause-structure is the selection of an "interrogative" verb.

These examples point up another defect of the older use of translation in language-teaching: a tendency to think of translation in terms of equivalence at *word*-rank, as if "translation" somehow means "word-for-word" translation. Indeed, I think that quite a number of teachers who distrust the use of translation in language teaching hold some such belief. If you are talking about translation, they seem to think, then you must be talking about word-for-word translation. I hope I have been able to show that this is an erroneous belief. Translation-equivalence, and therefore *genuine* translation, only rarely involves word-for-word equivalence.

To sum up these remarks on translation and language teaching, I would like to repeat something I have said elsewhere, and which I feel rather strongly. The old-fashioned "grammar-translation method" has been widely comdemned. But it is important to see that what has to be condemned is not so much the method itself as the fact that many, perhaps most, of its practitioners used *bad* grammar and *bad* translation, and used both of them badly. It is possible to use good grammar and to use it well, and it is also possible to make some good uses of good translation in language teaching.

I turn now to the question of sociolinguistics and translation. One of the aspects of sociolinguistics mentioned by Dr. Ferguson was the question of relating varieties of languages to social groupings and to social functions of language. In these terms we identify various types of language-variety, such as dialect, register, and style.

Roughly speaking, by *dialect* we mean subvarieties of a 'whole language' which can be correlated with certain rather permanent characteristics of a speaker or writer, such as where he comes from ("geographical dialect"), or what period of time he belongs to ("temporal dialect" or "état de langue" to use the more familiar technical term), or what social class he belongs to ("social dialect").

Other language-varieties, such as register and style, correlate rather with more transient characteristics relating to the particular situation in which a speaker or writer is operating at a given time. Thus *register* correlates with the particular social role being filled by the speaker or writer, or the particular social function of his utterance, at a given moment. Thus we have *scientific* register, *religious* register, *advertising* register, and so on. *Style*, on the other hand, correlates rather with the number and nature of a speaker's or writer's addressees, and his relationship to them. Thus we have *formal* style, *casual* style, *intimate* style, and the like.

Another type of transient variety is *mode*: this correlates with the selection on a given occasion of the *spoken* or *written* medium for the manifestation of language. There are sometimes particular grammatical or lexical items or features which are characteristically related to the spoken rather than the written medium and *vice versa*, and these are characteristics of different *modes*.

The existence of language-varieties has implications for both language teaching and translation. In connection with language teaching, we must obviously decide before designing a course, or writing materials, just what dialect, register(s), style(s), etc. our students are going to require: and with advanced students, particularly in the study of literary texts, we ought to be prepared to teach at least some of the characteristics of different registers and styles (and perhaps also dialects) the use of which produces various literary effects.

The existence of language-varieties raise problems in translation. For one thing, two different languages, between which translation is being performed, may not have corresponding systems of varieties, and the selection of an *equivalent* variety may thus pose a problem. Secondly, there may be differences in the *compatability* of varieties in the two languages. English shows considerable tolerance in this respect, but there are many language in which, for example, religious register is quite incompatable with informal or casual style. Again, in English, there is no incompatability between dialects and modes. In principle, you can either speak or write any dialect of English, though some dialects are much more frequently presented in writing than others: but novelists, as we all know, frequently try to represent dialectal speech of various kinds in their dialogue. However, in the translation into Hindi of certain English novels and short stories no attempt is made to render markedly regional or substandard English by regional or substandard Hindi. This may be due to an incompatability in Hindi between substandard dialect and written mode.

A final point I would like to mention is that varieties are characterised, or *marked*, by a wide range of features: there are lexical, grammatical, phonological, phonetic, or statistical "markers" of particular varieties. For example, one of the markers of English scientific register is a high percentage occurrence of *passive* verb-forms--from 30 to 50% in scientific texts as opposed to 1 or 2% in everyday conversation. The equivalent variety in Russian is not marked by a particularly high percentage of passives, but by other things, such as the very frequent occurrence of a verb which can sometimes (though not in the example which follows) be translated as "presents itself." Thus in a Russian scientific text you do not say "Oxygen is a gas" but, in effect, "Oxygen presents itself as a gas." So, then, in translating a scientific text from Russian into English one must be aware of the fact that there are certain markers in the Russian text which characterise it as a scientific text, and this leads to the selection of an appropriate variety of English, characterised by quite different markers. In other words, translation-equivalence has to be set up between *varieties*, and the question then is, what are the markers of this particular variety in the target language, irrespective of what they are in the source language.

Here is one more example of the relevance of sociolinguistic factors to translation, from Scottish Gaelic once again. The Gaelic system of numerals is, in part, *vigesimal*--large numbers are counted in twenties. Thus, for "one hundred and twenty-five men" one says in Gaelic, in effect, "six twenty men and five." Now whether you actually translate that into English as "six score men and five" or as "one hundred and twenty-five men" will depend on the total social function of the text--on the register of the Gaelic text and the equivalent register in English. If the text is a folktale, for example, the translation-equivalent may well be "six score men and five" since the use of this kind of vegesimal counting by "scores" is a marker of English folktale register. If, on the other hand, the text is a report of a strike at a herring-canning factory the English translation-equivalent would be "125 men."

So, then, a translator must always be able to recognize the social function of his text, through recognition of the linguistic markers of a particular variety which relates to that social function: and this ability is also important for the learner of a language, at an advanced stage, when he is studying literature and perhaps practicing translation.

In conclusion I would like to say that translation is not a technique to be used wildly and indiscriminately in language teaching. Nevertheless, if one understands the limitations of translation, and the nature of translation-equivalence, one can use it sparingly even for the initial presentation of language material. Moreover, translation itself is a valuable skill to be imparted to one's students, and, carefully handled, is one of the most efficient ways of inculcating precision in the use of the language being taught. This can best be done on the basis of, and drawing upon, some kind of theory of translation, some knowledge of what translation *is* and of the implications, sociolinguistic and other, of translation-equivalence.

RESEARCH IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING

John B. Carroll, Harvard University

In the space of 20 minutes, I can hardly say much of substantive value about research in second language teaching. For there is a great deal of this research--either already done, or in progress--and it would take a great deal of time even to try to distill the major findings and conclusions of this research, and much more time to describe it in detail or to evaluate the hundreds of studies that have been done.

One thing I *can* do, and do fairly quickly, is to bring to your attention several sources of information about research in foreign language teaching, so that if you are interested you can go to these sources.

First of all, let me make sure that you know about several of my own writings that have attempted to summarize the findings of research about foreign language teaching. I am assuming, by the way, that most of the research on "foreign" or "second" language learning is as relevant to the teaching of English as a second language as it is to the teaching of such foreign languages as French, German, Spanish, or Russian to non-speakers of those languages.

The book that I wrote in 1953, The Study of Language (Harvard University Press) contains ample references to the research on foreign language teaching that had been done up to that time. Remember that a considerable amount of research had been done on FL teaching back in the early 1930's by a group of language teachers and educational psychologists led by Algernon Coleman. There are some who believe that with his urging of what he called the reading objective, Coleman set back foreign language teaching several centuries. At any rate, Coleman made a massive contribution with his editing of a series of annotated bibliographies on the subject, published by the University of Chicago Press in 1933 and 1938, with a further supplement published in 1949. Note also the important work, in the early post-war period in the late 1940's, of a research project called An Investigation of Second-Language Teaching, conducted by Frederick Agard and Harold Dunkel, and published by Ginn and Co. in 1949. The companion volume by Dunkel, called Second Language Learning, also published by Ginn in the same year, is an excellent summary of what was known about the psychology of second-language learning up to that time.

Around 1960, I was asked to contribute a chapter on "Research on Teaching Foreign Languages" to a Handbook of Research on Teaching, edited by N. L. Gage and published by Rand McNally, 1963. In this chapter I tried to cover the most important researches on second-language learning that had been done up to around 1961. Its bibliography contained 192 references, but even then, space limitations forced me to omit reference to many other meritorious and useful research studies. Nevertheless, at many places I had to point out that research had not yet provided clear answers to problems of concern to the foreign language teacher. Now, because of the large amount of research being carried out currently, it is possible that we will soon have better answers than we have had before, or that we will at least have answers where we had only questions before. It will be necessary for us to keep up with this large literature. I myself am finding it difficult to keep well informed of the mountains of researach literature that are coming out in foreign language teaching, psycholinguistics, verbal learning, and related areas.

I can refer you now to three papers that bring the review of research literature more or less up to date. The first was by me; it was explicitly an attempt to update the review I had previously done in the Gage Handbook; thus, it was called "Research in Foreign Language Teaching: The Last Five Years." It was published in the Proceedings of the 1966 Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, and those proceedings may be purchased from the MLA Materials Center, 4 Washington Place, New York City 10003. A second article, also by me, was the reprint of a speech I gave in September 1964 at an international conference in Berlin on the teaching of foreign languages; my speech, entitled, "The contributions of psychological theory and educational research to the teaching of foreign languages" is now available in the Modern Language Journal, 1965, volume 49, pp. 273-281. Thirdly, I want to mention a truly ambitious publication entitled Research on Language Teaching, An Annotated International Bibliography, 1945-64, edited by Howard Lee Nostrand and some colleagues of his and published in 1965 by the University of Washington Press, Seattle. This is just what it's called, an annotated bibliography of just about everything conceivably relevant to language teaching--from applied linguistics, psycholinguistics, educational research, and the research writings of foreign language teachers themselves.

I should also mention a two-part essay by Wallace E. Lambert, entitled "Psychological approaches to the study of language," published in the Modern Language Journal, 1963, Volume 47, February and March, pp. 51-62 and 114-121. This is an excellent survey of psycholinguistics for the foreign language teacher.

Well, enough of bibliography--I do not usually write speeches around bibliographical citations, and would not have done it today except that I have always been amazed at how little many language teachers seem to know about the research literatures in their own fields. Of course, there is a difficulty here: research literature is usually written for other researchers, or maybe for some government department that sponsored the research. In the former case, the researcher feels he must present his evidence with all the fancy statistical trimmings, and in a suitably dull and pedantic style. In the latter case, he may take the attitude that it doesn't much matter how he writes up his research because the report is just going to be filed away somewhere, unread, uninterpreted, and unevaluated. In either case, research is seldom written for the ultimate consumer--the classroom teacher. This means that there must be a middle-man--a person who is conversant with the research and its technical trappings but who can also interpret it for the professional teacher. I take it that is my job here.

Before launching into any summary interpretation of research, I would also like to emphasize something about the attitude of the true researcher that is possibly difficult for the classroom teacher to understand. The true researcher has to be what he calls "hard-nosed"--that is, he has to be highly objective and dispassionate, giving equal weight to all the possibilities and refusing to be swayed by the unsupported claims of the proponents of various methods or systems of teaching languages. He refuses to be impressed by the mere impressionistic report of a teacher that this or that method or procedure was highly effective; he needs hard evidence that is obtainable only by properly designed experiments with control groups and valid measurements. Such research is exceedingly hard to come by, for various reasons. It is expensive; it requires patience, time, and effort; and it requires cooperation and understanding on the part of the teachers and students who may be involved. And even when such research is done, it not infrequently turns out that the results are rather inconclusive--that after all the time and effort has been expended it is still impossible to make definite assertions about how to teach languages, or about whatever question had been posed in the research. Part of the trouble, of course, is that human behavior is quite complex, and as is often said, it is difficult to control or measure all the variables that enter into any particular learning situation. I don't think this state of affairs is really bad. For one thing, it teaches us that foreign language teaching is a complicated, little understood business and that as long as teachers and students give their best efforts the results will be relatively little affected by what methods of teaching are used. But don't misunderstand me: I would underline the phrase best efforts. I can easily document the conclusion that students must be well motivated, and teachers must do their best. Furthermore, it is easy to support the conclusion that it helps if the students are apt, and it is essential that the teaching be competent and the materials of instruction sound and adequate. These rather commonsense conclusions must be taken for granted; much of the available research merely illustrates and confirms them. Beyond that, research can only make small inroads into questions of exactly what kinds of teaching are most competent, what kinds of instructional materials are most sound, adequate, and feasible, and what kinds of students are most apt to learn. For after all, people have been teaching foreign languages for centuries, if not millenia, and while foreign language teaching has had its failures, it has always been able to show its marked successes.

One kind of research that I think is extremely important, as a matter of fact, is research that will show exactly how much success is enjoyed by language training programs, and under what conditions it is enjoyed. I am not aware of anything quite like this in the case of teaching English as a foreign language, because for various reasons there has been much more research on the teaching of foreign languages to Americans than research on the teaching of English as a second language. I can, however, cite one or two instances of the kind of research I mean. One is a study than I am just finishing--a study of language training in the Peace Corps, and by this I mean the training of the Volunteers themselves, as it happened, in Spanish. I was concerned with how much progress a person with a given amount of aptitude for foreign languages and a given amount of prior knowledge of Spanish could make in the 12 week language training program established by the Peace Corps. I have assumed that these Peace Corps trainees are about as highly motivated a group as one could get; most of them, as you know, are eager young people aged 21 or 22. I have assumed also that the training program they receive is about the best that can be had--it is an audio-lingual course based upon the Modern Language Association's text in Spanish, and it is taught in small sections with native or near-native instructors. At the start of training, the trainees were all given the Carroll-Sapon Modern Language Aptitude Test, and those who had some prior knowledge of Spanish were given a placement test to determine how much Spanish they knew. It turns out that if you know the language aptitude of the student and how much Spanish he already knows (which could in this case range from zero to native fluency) you can make highly accurate predictions of how much he will have achieved at the end of 12 weeks training. You can also make quite good predictions of how much Spanish he will know at the end of 6 or 8 months in the field. As a typical result, I can say roughly that the person with average language aptitude and with no prior knowledge of Spanish can achieve at the end of 12 weeks about 50 percent of the competence he needs to use the language comfortably and fluently in the field; on the average, however, he will attain this competence after he has been in the field about 6 months. I can make similar statements for individuals with different degrees of language aptitude or for different amounts of prior training in Spanish. Such information is highly useful to the Peace Corps or any other agency that is concerned with the selection and training of individuals for service that involves competence in a foreign language. Of course, this is a somewhat special situation because it involves an intensive language training course, with 5 or 6 hours a day devoted to language study.

One of the major results of all research on foreign languages, as a matter of fact, is the importance of the time variable. Even under the best systems of instruction, it takes time to learn a language, and one can pretty well predict what can be accomplished after 100 hours, 200 hours, or 300 hours of instruction. My research shows that for a person starting from scratch, control of the structure of a language and its ordinary vocabulary requires something like 300 hours of instruction, plus or minus about 100 depending upon the individual's language aptitude. Any training course that is not planned with this in mind is subject to failure. The typical college course with 3 to 5 hours a week of instruction has obvious drawbacks, because it takes several years for the student to accumulate enough hours of instruction really to master the language.

I would suggest that careful studies be made concerning the amount of training required to bring various categories of foreign students up to suitable levels of competence in English.

Incidentally, the research that I have done has been possible only because there have been developed, either by me or others, quite accurate measurements of language aptitude and language achievement. Unfortunately, we do not yet have adequate measures of language aptitude appropriate for non-native speakers of English, although this is something I have been working on. An Italian version of my language aptitude test is already commercially available in Italy, and a German version will shortly be available. More work is needed, as we are all aware, on the measurement of proficiency in English. All this research requires time, effort, and above all, funds.

As an example of research that attempts to compare different systems of instruction, I would direct your attention to the experiment conducted at the University of Colorado by George Scherer and Michael Wertheimer, a report of which is now published in book form, A Psycho-linguistic Experiment in Foreign Language Teaching (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1964). This was a two-year experiment designed to compare the effectiveness of college German instructional programs based on different approaches: one, the grammar-translation method, with its emphasis on reading and writing, and the other, the "audio-lingual" method, with its emphasis on the goals of speaking and listening comprehension. Two experimental groups were set up--one for each method, and the instructional staff for each method did its best to accomplish the most results.

Unfortunately, the results of the experiment were somewhat inconclusive because it was found administratively impractical to maintain rigorous separation of the experimental groups throughout the whole term of the experiment. However, the results for the first-year classes were fairly unambiguous: listening and speaking skills were "far superior" in the audio-lingually trained group, and reading and writing skills were at least significantly better in the traditionally trained group. In the second year, the two groups were merged and given a common course of instruction; at the end of that year, the differences in achievement between the two groups largely disappeared, except--and this is interesting--in the active skills; i.e., speaking and writing. That is, at the end of the second year, the audio-lingual groups were better in speaking, while the grammar-translation students were, on the average, better in writing. This result not only confirms the obvious generalization that students learn (if they learn anything at all) exactly what is taught to them, but it also shows that specific methods of teaching can have rather enduring effects.

I have no time to recount all the special experiments that have been done on the teaching of sound systems, grammar, or vocabulary, but I can make the general statement that we are starting to arrive at some quite definite conclusions about certain aspects of these problems. For one important example, I would like to mention that one overriding principle is very clearly supported by research. This is something known to good language teachers, but often forgotten by both good and poor teachers: namely, that the best way to learn a language is by using it in communication about real things, needs, and problems. Even the best method, the audio-lingual, can fall flat on its face if it does not require the student to practice using patterns in real situations. This means, incidentally, that the patterns which need most attention are those which are of most use in real situations. This is something that seems forgotten by some of the texts I have seen. Teaching the student to say "John puts his hat on his head" is to teach him a pattern that he really has relatively little use for unless he is writing a movie scenario!

PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENTS DEMANDED OF THE LANGUAGE LEARNER

R. C. Gardner, University of Western Ontario

Learning is defined in many textbooks of psychology as a relatively permanent change in behavior as a result of experience. Not included in this definition is the fact, of which we are all aware, that some learners demonstrate such changes in behavior more rapidly than do others. In any learning situation, the individual brings many characteristics with him which may either facilitate or impede how well and how rapidly he learns.

This paper is a summary of a series of research studies onducted by Dr. Lambert and myself which were concerned with delineating the characteristics of the individual which influence how successful he will be in acquiring a language--or more specifically a second language. I hope to demonstrate to you that these characteristics are slightly different than the characteristics which are important in other learning situations and that consequently the adjustments demanded of the language learner are somewhat unique.

While most of you are teachers of English as a second language, unfortunately much of the research that I am going to describe was conducted with students learning French as a second language. Nonetheless, it would seem reasonable to expect that many of the phenomena that were noted with English speaking students learning French would also be descriptive of the student learning English as a second language. In fact, some of these factors may be even more important in the latter case, particularly if the student is in a foreign or alien environment where he is isolated from others who speak his native language.

Variables, such as the quality of instruction, the teaching techniques employed, and the opportunities for practice, undoubtedly influence how well the student will acquire the language. While I shall not discuss them, their importance cannot be over-emphasized. I would like, instead, to highlight two characteristics of the student which appear to influence the degree to which he will profit from instruction. These two characteristics are the student's intellectual or cognitive abilities and his motivation.

Learning a second language involves the acquisition of a series of skills. The student must acquire vocabulary knowledge, grammatical forms, pronunciation skills, etc. To some extent this learning will be facilitated by abilities or previously acquired skills; that is, what he already knows, or what he already can do, will aid him in acquiring new skills. The concept of an "ability" implies that the individual has an existing skill which will facilitate his acquiring new skills.

What constitutes language learning abilities is a problem that has been investigated by educational psychologists and linguists since the early 1900's. The most extensive study, however, of the nature of language learning abilities, or language aptitude, is that published by Carroll in 1958. He analyzed the interrelations of a number of ability tests, and the relation of these to language course grades in two samples of Air Force Personnel. The results indicated that three facters--inductive language learning ability, associative memory, and linguistic interest--were most highly related to grades in the course. As a result of this, and further studies, he isolated five tests, subsequently published as the Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT) (1959), which measures abilities necessary for second language achievement.

Since the tests correlate highly with language course grades, it is evident that they measure abilities which facilitate language learning; and, by the nature of the tests, the aspects of second language achievement that are facilitated can be inferred. We tested these inferences in one study [Gardner and Lambert, 1965], and although one study is by no means definitive, the results indicated that learning a second languages involves the learning of a series of relatively independent skills and the acquisition of each of these seems to depend upon a different ability. The particular study was concerned with 96 English-speaking high school students in Louisiana who were studying French as a second language. The relationships among scores on the language ability measures [the MLAT], measures of intelligence [Thurstone's (1941) Primary Mental Abilities], and 13 measures of French achievement were determined by factor analysis. This technique allows one to investigate mathematically the inter-relations of all the tests and to identify those which cluster together; i.e., those which form separate factors. If, for example, the aptitude tests and the intelligence tests fell in the same cluster, this would indicate that these tests were measuring similar skills. If some of the measures of French achievement also appeared in the same cluster, this would in turn indicate that these measures of language aptitude and intelligence were in fact measuring skills important for the acquisition of this aspect of French.

The results of the study indicated, however, that the tests of language aptitude do measure abilities which are important for second language acquisition and that intelligence, at least over the range sampled, was related neither to measures of second language achievement nor to language aptitude. Specifically, the results indicated that there were four relatively independent aspects of achievement in French and that each of these was highly related to a different measure of language aptitude. The four achievement factors that were isolated, and the ability which appeared to facilitate the acquisition of each were as follows:

I. Vocabulary Knowledge. This cluster included the knowledge of word meanings, word forms, and word pronunciation. It was closely associated with a measure of phonetic-coding ability, suggesting that the individual who is able to code incoming linguistic material and retain this information over a period of time will more readily acquire a knowledge of the vocabulary of a second language than one who is unable to do this.

II. Oral Reading Fluency. This factor included measures of skill in reading aloud a standard French passage, fluently, accurately, and with the accent characteristics that had been stressed in the language course. It was most closely associated with a measure of auditory alertness and memory, suggesting that the student who is capable of recognizing and remembering pronunciation differences will be able subsequently to reproduce them.

III. Grammatical Knowledge. This factor refers to the recognition of appropriate grammatical forms in the second language and was highly related to an ability measure of the student's awareness of grammatical distinctions in English. In short, the student familiar with the grammatical structure of his own language, uses this information when he is learning the grammatical distinctions of a second language.

IV. Relative French Sophistication. The title for this cluster is somewhat arbitrary, but it highlights the fact that the cluster measures isolated on this factor had in common the characteristic that they were extremely difficult for beginning students. The measures required the students to understand fluent French conversations, to speak French spontaneously, and to read and to understand complex French passages. Students performing well on these three tasks were those who scored highly on a test measuring the ability to infer meaning from relatively complex material.

In addition to these four aspects of French achievement, three other clusters were also found. Two of these were composed of the measures of intelligence, one made up of the measures of general intelligence, the other of verbal intelligence, particulary as measured by English vocabulary tests.

The final cluster was composed of all the measures of language aptitude. That is, although four of the sub-tests did in fact measure abilities which were of direct importance for acquiring skill in specific aspects of achievement in French, all five of these sub-tests also tended to be related to each other. Dr. Carroll has similarly reported this communality, and has interpreted it as reflecting a general linguistice interest--since what is common to all of the tests is the relatively unusual linguistic material involved. In the present study this communality was found to be involved in many of the tests of achievement in French, indicating its general importance for language achievement. One extremely interesting aspect of this element of linguistic interest was its relationship to the intelligence sub-test measuring inductive reasoning. Thus, this linguistic interest seems to depend upon inductive reasoning ability, and seems to be the only indication in our data of a link between intelligence and language learning aptitude.

In general, the results of this study suggest that intelligence is virtually unrelated to achievement in French or to recently developed measures of language aptitude. In addition, it is evident that distinctions can be made among at least four independent skills in the early stages of second language learning. This is not to say that achievement in one of these skills is completely unrelated to achievement in another. It would be difficult, for example, to see how a student could be skilled in French oral reading without a knowledge of French vocabulary or grammar. The data do suggest, however, that despite the interrelations among these various achievements, it is possible to delineate basic components which appear to depend upon different aptitudes.

These results may not be directly applicable to students learning English as a second language since it is possible that the abilities of non-English speaking students which facilitate the learning of English may be different from those described here. However, the high validity coefficients obtained for these ability tests among student in many second languages support the conclusion that differences in abilities provide for differences in second language achievement. Furthermore, as the above results indicate, there is undoubtedly not one language learning ability, but a number of abilities, each of which provides the basis for the acquisition of a given skill. Differences in these abilities will produce differences in the rate at which second language skills will be acquired.

The second characteristic of the individual which influences second language achievement is motivation. While there are many factors such as a desire to do well in a course, anxiety about failure, etc. which might motivate the student, we have studied the reward value of the language itself; that is, we have assumed that the student who experiences reward for his new language bahavior will acquire the language more readily than the student who does not experience reward. Undoubtedly, many things can provide reward value for such behavior. For example, a good teacher can make the language learning situation exciting and thus provide a rewarding atmosphere. This may, however, be specific to that teacher. The language is to be used in other situations, and the removal of that teacher may remove the rewarding aspects of the language. I once had the opportunity to view a grade 3 class in the Montreal area. These students had been selected for a special one year French program in which two hours each day were devoted to learning French. Their teacher was an exciting and dynamic young lady. Admittedly, the students were selected for their aptitude, but the level of French achievement among these English speaking students was extremely high. They spoke French almost as fluently and as accurately as they did English--and I saw them within five months of the initiation of the project. Unfortunately, later reports indicated that when they advanced to other classes, and away from this teacher, their level of competence declined to the level of other students who had never had that rewarding experience.

The student, in the process of acquiring a second language, is adopting various features of behavior which characterize another linguistic and cultural group. The vocabulary, grammatical forms, pronunciations, and sounds have a meaning over and above that which the teacher is trying to present. They are representations of another cultural community, and the student's reactions to that community, or toward out-groups in general, will determine the ease with which he will incorporate these responses. In short, if there are consistent rewards available for certain language behavior, this behavior will continue and will become part of the habitual system of the individual.

Our linking of motivation with attitudes led us, early in our research, to consider the student's possible objectives in language study. Classifying the reasons that students gave for studying a second language suggested two main objectives or orientations. One was the instrumental orientation. Included under this category were all the reasons that implied the utilitarian value of second language acquisition. These included such reasons as: "it will enable me to get a better job," "I need it for my education," etc. Contrasted with the instrumental was the integrative orientation in which the objectives of language study emphasized the value of the language because it would permit the individual to move closer to the other language group. Such reasons for studying French as: "learning French can be valuable because I can learn more about the French way of life," or "I can get to know more French speaking people," were classified as integrative because they seemed to describe an interest in the other language community coupled with a desire to become a part of it.

The distinction between the integrative and the instrumental orientations has remained significant in all of our studies. Typically, the integratively oriented student has been more highly motivated than the instrumentally oriented one, and typically, too, he has been more successful in second language acquisition. However, the nature of the integratively motivated student is elusive; it seems to depend upon the socio-cultural situation in which the student finds himself and possibly upon the level of second-language skill he has attained. In Montreal for example, English speaking students begin learning French in elementary school. By the time they reach high school, many of them are relatively sophisticated in the language. Our Montreal studies have indicated that the integrative motive is related to positive attitudes toward the French speaking community.

In one study [Gardner and Lambert, 1959] for example, we investigated the relationships between measures of language aptitude, motivation, attitudes toward the French speaking community, the students' reasons for studying French (orientation), and the relationship of these measures to teacher's ratings of the individual achievements in French of 75 Grade XI English speaking students. The results indicated that two factors influenced achievement. One of these, as one might expect, was language aptitude. The second component was what we described as an integrative motive; that is, students who expressed a favorable attitude toward the French speaking community, who expended a lot of energy in learning French, and who gave integrative reasons for learning French also were rated highly in achievement in the language. We labelled this "the integrative motive" because it seemed to describe an individual learning the language in order to become accepted in the other cultural group.

These two components, language aptitude and the integrative motive, were not related to each other, which implies that students either with high linguistic aptitude or with a strong integrative motive will tend to be successful in second language acquisition. However, those students who have the requisite abilities and who, at the same time, are integratively motivated will be even more successful in language study. A subsequent study [Gardner, 1960], also done in Montreal, confirmed these results, and extended our understanding of the role of motivational variables. That investigation was comparable to the previous one except that we employed nine objective measures of various achievements in French. The results were similar to those described above: both language aptitude and the integrative motive were related to measures of achievement taught specifically in the classroom situation. However, only the integrative motive related appreciably to language skills which would be acquired outside the classroom in interaction with members of the French speaking community; that is, the student with the requisite abilities and/or the integratively motivated student profitted from classroom instruction. The integratively motivated student also profitted from language experiences outside the classroom.

Similar patterns emerge when we study students with less formal language training who do not live in an active bicultural community, except for one important difference. We have had the opportunity of testing English speaking high school students who were in their first or second year of French in Connecticut, Maine, and Louisiana [Lambert, Gardner, Olton, and Tunstall, 1962]. In all three settings, measures of language achievement were related to language aptitude and to the integrative motivational variables. In these settings, however, attitudes toward the French speaking community were generally not related to achievement in French, whereas authoritarian attitudes, reflecting a generalized suspicion, distrust, and dislike of all other cultural groups, were associated with poor second language achievement. This difference is not particularly startling because in these areas the French speaking community is not as actively present as in Montreal. Then too, the students are not so proficient in the language that they would experience reward communicating with members of the other language community. However, students who hold authoritarian attitudes, who tend to dislike outgroups in general, display a marked inability to learn a second language. In short, the motivational-attitudinal complex also asserts itself here but in a slightly different form.

Generalizing from the studies cited above, it appears reasonable to suggest that second language learning involves the acquisition of language skills which are characteristic of another linguistic-cultural group. Since one aspect of the task involves skill learning, the student with the requisite abilities will have a marked advantage. Another aspect of the task involves the acquisition of the language habits of another cultural group. Consequently, the individual's reactions to that group, or to outgroups in general, will also influence his language development primarily because it affects his motivation. Where contact with the other language group is limited, it seems that generalized attitudes toward outgroups are more important, but where active contact with the other group is possible, specific group attitudes seem to be of prime importance. In both cases, the student's orientation in language acquisition appears to be the dominant component. The student who maintains an integrative orientation, who learns the language because it allows him access to the other language community, is typically the more motivated and more successful student.

Treating second language acquisition as a process of other group enculturation highlights one further adjustment demanded of the student. As the student becomes more proficient in the second language, he may find that he is beginning to identify as strongly with the other linguistic-cultural group as he does his own community; that is, he becomes what Newcomb terms a "marginal man," being at the same time a member of two different groups, and consequently not truly a member of either. Studies of students enrolled in intensive six-week French language programs [Lambert, Gardner, Barik, and Tunstall, 1963] demonstrated increases in feelings of anomie--normlessness or not belonging to any cultural group--as the course progressed. Since these students were all, at the beginning, relatively skilled in French, the implication is that with advanced language assimilation there develops a feeling of marginality--of being neither truly North American or truly French. As the students progressed to the point that they "thought" in French, it was noted that their feelings of anomie also increased. At the same time, they tried to find means of using English even though they had pledged to use only French for the six week period. The pattern suggests that such students experience anomie when they concentrate on and commence to master a second language and that, as a consequence, they develop strategems to control or minimize such feelings. This same type of marginality feeling seems to characterize even bilingual children. In a study of bilingual and French monolingual ten-year-old children in Montreal, data were gathered on the children's attitudes toward both the English and French communities. The results indicated that the bilingual children had more favorable attitudes toward the English group and less favorable attitudes to the French group than did the French monolingual children. Other data indicated that these bilingual children had identified themselves with both groups whereas the French monolingual children showed allegiances more to the French group. That is, the bilingual children gave evidence of feelings of marginality, whereas the monolingual children did not.

In summary, then, there appear to be three psychological adjustments demanded of the second language learner: first, he must adjust to the cognitive task itself--to achieve this end easily, he requires reasonably specific abilities which are independent of intelligence; second, he must adjust to the emotional or motivational task--if he is oriented motivationally toward learning the language in order to be accepted by the cultural group, he will experience less difficulty than if he is learning the language for other purposes; finally, if he becomes proficient in the language, he will experience feelings of normlessness, of belonging to no one cultural group--a conflict that may be resolved by increased striving to identity more closely with one of the two groups.

GUIDELINES FOR PLANNING CLASSES AND TEACHING MATERIALS

Clifford H. Prator, University of California at Los Angeles

A full title for this paper would be "Guidelines for Planning Classes and Teaching Materials--from Manipulation to Communication." I am afraid that, upon hearing it, some members of this audience may sigh and mutter to themselves something like, "Oh no, not again!" There is no doubt a grave danger that I will become known in NAFSA circles as Mr. Communication. If I dare, again this year, present to this group a paper dealing with the role of communication in language teaching, after having spoken on the same general topic two years ago in Minneapolis and to other groups about the same matter several times since then, it is because there appeared to be at least two good reasons for doing so. Firstly, our excellent Program Chairman particularly suggested that topic, insisting that further clarification of the concept of communication may be one of the most promising ways of arriving at a truly helpful answer to the question, "After pattern practice, what?" Secondly, since Minneapolis two of the colleagues for whose opinions regarding methodology I have most respect, Donald Bowen and Earl Stevick, have dealt in print with the subject, so that now the kind of colloquy through which progress is often achieved becomes possible.

In the paper delivered in Minneapolis, which has since been printed [NAFSA Studies and Papers, English Language Series, No. 10, pp. 57-62], under the title "Development of a Manipulation-Communication Scale," I tried to point out that, under the influence of the linguists, we language teachers had come to attach an almost obsessive importance to the systematic nature of language and seemed to be overlooking the significance of its communicative function. In practice this has led in many recent textbooks to serious over-use of imitative, repetitive drills of a rigidly structured type, and to almost complete neglect of exercises of a communicative sort, in which the student is encouraged to express his own thoughts and allowed to choose from his already internalized inventory the necessary words and grammatical structures. I called the imitative activities "manipulation" and the other kind "communication." My contention was that these texts that contained only manipulative exercises made it very difficult for a teacher to bring his students to the point of communicating in the classroom and thus to give his classes a sense of direction. The distrust of communication and the resulting failure to study the ways in which it could be approached gradually also deprived the teacher of guidelines for organizing his work at advanced levels of instruction, where students simply must be given their head. The paper represented an attempt to indicate how such a sense of direction could be achieved and how such guidelines could be found.

It urged that a class hour should normally begin with manipulation and end with communication, moving by gradual stages from the one to the other. It argued further that the same progression should characterize the movement from elementary to advanced instruction, with manipulation predominating in the former and communication in the latter. It expressed the opinion that existing courses of study too often passed from a year or two of almost pure manipulation to years of unbridled communication, without going through the necessary long and slow transition during which the two elements were blended in carefully measured doses. In other words, it advocated allowing some communication earlier and requiring some manipulation later than is the usual current practice.

The paper maintained that, for our purposes, the simplest and the most serviceable definition of manipulative activities is those in which the student is required to imitate immediately a model supplied by teacher, tape, or textbook. Communicative activities would then be those in which no direct model is supplied but the student himself finds the sounds, vocabulary, and patterns needed to express what he wishes to communicate. Thus defined, manipulation minimizes the possibility of error on the part of the student, whereas communication allows him full freedom to make mistakes. Naturally, this free rein is given him only when the teacher is reasonably certain that he can perform almost without error what he is asked to do. This consideration becomes the guideline for determining the speed with which the whole transition from manipulation to communication can take place. The progression from the one to the other is basically a matter of gradual decontrol.

When the various types of classroom activities are examined from this point of view, some are found to be entirely manipulative, such as the imitative repetition of a dialogue when the model for each sentence is provided by a tape. Others, such as original unrehearsed composition, are seen to be purely communicative. But most activities turn out to involve both manipulation and communication in varying proportions. Thus a dialogue memorized several days previously and then recited in class without a model to copy, while still predominantly manipulative, clearly contains some element of communication, since the student bears a greater responsibility for the choice of words and sounds and since the possibility of his making an error is greater than it was when he was first learning the dialogue.

It should then be possible to classify specific activities somewhere along a scale running from manipulation to communication. We could probably achieve a fairly high level of agreement in assigning activities to one of four categories: manipulative, predominantly manipulative, predominantly communicative, and communicative. Our guideline would lead us then to organize our classes so that exercises of the first type were followed by those of the second type, and so on through the series. It would give us a means of determining, for example, that double-repetition drills should follow rather than precede single-repetition drills.

Donald Bowen subscribed to this basic theory in the appendix entitled "Pedagogy" that he contributed to the Stockwell-Bowen-Martin contrastive analysis of The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish [Contrastive Structure Series, University of Chicago Press, 1965, pp. 292-309]. The appendix includes the most complete inventory I have yet seen of recommended language-teaching activities classified according to the kind of manipulation-communication scale described above. The drill types are listed under the following general headings, from most manipulative to most communicative: substitution, transformation, response, translation, indirect discourse, and free communication. Unfortunately, time will not allow me to give you a detailed summary of the contents of the appendix; I can only recommend it to those of you who may not already be familiar with it as a very helpful spelling out of the way the guidelines we have been discussing here can be used.

In a few respects, my own experience and convictions lead me to differ with the author on the appendix. Thus, the kinds of activities he groups under translation--which, incidentally, bear little resemblance to the type of translation that characterized some older methods of instruction--seem to me to be distinctly more communicative than the activities classified under indirect discourse. In a typical directed-discourse drill the teacher, after giving a sentence in the target language himself, asks a student to relay what he has heard to the rest of the class, beginning the new sentence with "He says that...." To be sure, in this situation the student has to change the person of the pronouns and sometimes the form of the verbs, but for the rest of the sentence he has only to imitate the model supplied by the teacher. It would appear that the student bears considerably more responsibility of choice and is more apt to fall into error when the cue is given to him in his mother tongue and he is asked to respond in the target language, supplying all the correct words and sounds himself and guided only by the correspondence in meaning between the two languages.

I also fail to understand how the author can condemn blank-filling and multiple-choice exercises on the gounds that they "do not supply adequate context or do not allow responses that are typical of normal linguistic participation." He feels that these types are useful in testing but do not perform the essential function of drills, which is "to provide sufficient repetition in meaningful context to establish correct habitual responses" (p. 295). Both blank-filling and multiple-choice exercises may be administered either as tests or drills. When they are used as tests, each item is presented only once, and the student is expected to respond by supplying or choosing a single word or a short phrase. But they can equally well be used as drills, fulfilling all the criteria that the author sets up: the teacher can give the stimulus in the form of a complete sentence, indicating the blank by a slight pause and a gesture, and asking that the response be a complete sentence containing the missing word; each individual sentence or the exercise as a whole can be repeated any desired number of times. The context is certainly as adequate, the response as "typical of normal linguistic participation" as is the case with substitution drills. In fact, what could be a more normal linguistic situation than to come to a point in a sentence where one has to seek or choose the proper word to add next? The guideline we have been discussing would suggest the need, especially at advanced levels of instruction, of more exercises of the blank-filling and multiple-choice type, which permit students to take a short step from manipulation toward communication. Of particular value is the skeleton composition where most of the text is given but in which certain key words must be supplied by the student or chosen from a short list of alternatives. Such compositions are, of course, merely an elaborate form of blank-filling or multiple-choice drill.

Earl Stevick treated the matter of guidelines for planning classes and teaching materials in a paper delivered at the Indiana-Purdue Foreign Language Conference in March, 1965, and published along with the other conference papers as a special number of IJAL last January [Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 84-93]. The Stevick contribution bears the cryptic title, "UHF and Microwaves in Transmitting Language Skills."

For me, the most fascinating aspect of the paper is the way the author demonstrates once more his faculty for developing apt and striking terminology. He examines the transitions from exercise to exercise that can give a sense of direction to the class hour in terms of not two, but three dimensions: "muscular habituation," "responsibility," and "vividness." Muscular habituation is defined as referring to "drills and exercises of a highly systematic and repetitive kind aimed at development of muscular habits in sound production or in the use of grammatical patterns" (p. 85). Though Stevick's emphasis is slightly different, habituation seems to equate with what we have been calling manipulation. It should dominate the early stages of the lesson, the M-phase or manipulative phase, and is the necessary preparation for the more communicative activities that follow, the C-phase. Stevick's term, "habituation" may well be preferable to "manipulation." "Habituation" suggests a type of activity that is desirable, even indispensable--the proper connotation. On the other hand, "manipulation" has pejorative overtones and suggests something that one would like to avoid altogether.

The author's word for characterizing communicative activities is "responsibility," defined as including "the range of demands that may be made on a student: simple substitution, substitution with a correlated change elsewhere in the sentence, generation of a whole sentence in response to a visual stimulus, and so on" (p. 85). It is assumed that responsibility should gradually be transferred from the teacher to the students as the cycle of M-phase plus C-phase moves on toward its conclusion. The successive cycles are called "microwaves," hence the use of that term in the paper's title. Stevick adds to our theory of guidelines the suggestion that each microwave should be from 20 to 30 minutes long, so that the class would "receive the reward of communication in a new bit of the language at least once or twice an hour" (p. 88). This, presumably, would be the wave length in beginning courses; it appears obvious that at more advanced levels, where the bits of the language dealt with would have to be much larger, the wave length would be longer, possibly often extending beyond the limits of a single class period.

It is with regard to his third dimension, that of vividness, that I feel obliged to take issue with Stevick's guidelines. He states that "'vividness'" has to do with the degree of reality which meanings have in the mind of the student as he practices, and/or with his degree of interest in the content of what he is saying" (p. 85). Vividness is thus a sort of combination of comprehension and interest, and both of these get very short shrift indeed during the M-phase of the author's model microwave.

Stevick affirms the necessity for the "blind mimicry of meaningless sound" and the "brute manipulation of grammatical structures in the absence of meaning" at the beginning of the cycle, though he admits that "very few [students] can thrive on large doses of it" (pp. 86-87). In other words, he proposes that a teacher should plan deliberately to allow vividness to sink in a graceful curve to zero during the M-phase, in the expectation of being able to raise it again to a high level during the C-phase by the introduction of meaningful and interesting communication (pp. 89-90).

My objections to this part of the theory are threefold. In the first place, I have yet to be convinced that any real language learning takes place in a classroom while the students are pronouncing sounds or manipulating grammatical structures which for them are completely devoid of meaning. I still believe that the essence of language learning is the association of forms with meanings, achieved by practicing the former in the presence of the latter. I am aware that there has been a certain amount of experimentation lately, seeking to determine the effect of divorcing form from meaning in the early stages of instruction, but I have seen no evidence that any advantages that might thus be gained are sufficient to compensate for the loss of student motivation that is inevitably entailed.

In the second place, I cannot accept the idea that vividness, which Stevick sees as resulting from comprehension and interest, is a quality that can be turned off and on at will every 20 or 30 minutes. A student's interest in his class is a cumulative thing that grows or dwindles over relatively long periods of time; to lose it too often is to diminish it permanently. I would urge that the highest level of vividness that can be achieved be maintained at all times, that interest is too important for learning ever to be sacrificed deliberately, and that by careful planning a teacher can make it possible for students to perform even the most manipulative activity with full comprehension of meaning.

In the third place and by way of conclusion, I do not think that comprehension--or vividness--is a helpful guideline for planning classes and teaching materials. Communication, thought of in the very restricted sense in which we have defined it in this paper, is helpful because it can be easily measured and provided in systematically varying doses. So can manipulation or, if you prefer, habituation. But the presence or absence of comprehension is often difficult to prove objectively. It is a universal desideratum that should always accompany both manipulation and communication rather than a yardstick that may be of use in sequencing classroom activities or a compass that can point the way from one level of instruction to the next higher level.

SOME PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS FOR MAKING BETTER TESTS

Leslie A. Palmer, Educational Testing Service

To set the record straight and dispel any illusions anyone may have regarding the nature of work with tests, testing can be deadly dull and a crashing bore as well as a harrassment to the overworked teacher. But all teachers have to make tests and making good tests is not easy. There can be considerable compensation, however, for the teacher who likes challenging writing and manipulative puzzles.

Accumulated evidence over the past few years both from my correspondence and from questions asked at conferences and meetings indicates a great need for good English language tests of all kinds and at all levels. Admittedly, my perspective may be a bit biased because of my position as program director of the Test of English as a Foreign Language. TEFL's single greatest need is not more and better tests, as it sometimes seems, but there is a considerable requirement for such tests.

Examples of some of the requests and questions I have received follow:
-Do you have any tests for measuring the language handicap of foreign born illiterates?
-What tests do you recommend for testing second grade Mexican immigrants?
-Do you have tests of aural comprehension for Chinese speakers of English?
-Please send your test of speaking ability.
-What tests are available for measuring progress in intensive English courses?

Such a list could be extended ad nauseam but the above illustrate well enough the need for a variety of different kinds of English tests.

My standard answer to most requests for tests is to say that I am sorry that I cannot be of much help. I usually mention a few sources which may or may not be helpful and conclude by suggesting that the person had better try building his own tests.

If the implications of what I have said so far are that everybody needs English language tests and nobody has any good ones, they are not so intended. Obviously, many tests are produced locally, as they always will be, and some of them are very good. Standard tests such as TOEFL or the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency can be used whenever appropriate; but no large organization, or organizations for that matter, will every be able to provide enough tests of sufficient variety to meet everyone's needs.

Producing a good language test is not a mysterious process, but it does take a bit of imagination and some rather arduous and demanding labor. As with all human projects, the degree of success will be largely determined by the soundness of the planning and the thoroughness with which that plan is executed. And so this afternoon I would like to discuss briefly the steps which should be taken in preparing a test.

The first step must always be to state what is to be tested. A decision is made about which elements or integrative skills are to be measured. For tests at all levels, it is helpful to put such a statement in writing. And it is important that the statement be specific. For example, in planning a reading comprehension test, the statement might read as follows:

> This is to be an advanced test of reading comprehension using material typical of the reading required of students at the college freshman level. A wide range of reading skills is to be tested.
> (a) ability to comprehend the central idea of a paragraph.
> (b) ability to interpret facts presented, the meaning of sentences, etc.
> (c) ability to draw inferences from what is presented.
> (d) ability to respond to the tone and mood of a passage and to recognize the author's intention.
> Since this is an advanced test, minimal control will be exercised over the vocabulary and grammatical structures of the selected materials.

It is important at this stage to specify those factors which should be excluded from affecting the test results. For example, in an auditory comprehension test where the student is asked to respond by choosing from among several written choices, care must be taken to minimize the reading factor. Such control can be exercised by careful selection of vocabulary, choice of grammatical structures, limiting of the length of each choice, and provision of ample time between questions so that even the slow reader has time to examine all the options.

These decisions regarding what is to be tested should be put down on paper in outline form because they will help to clarify objectives. And the outline will be most helpful at the writing stage, where it will serve to keep the writers on the track and insure maximum control over the development of the proposed test.

The second step is to define the purposes to which the test is to be put. In other words, why is this test needed? Obviously tests are useful in many different situations and the following serve only to illustrate some of the more common uses:

(a) to determine whether a unit of study during a course has been learned--a progress test.
(b) to determine the extent to which material in a course has been mastered--an achievement test.
(c) to place students in various level courses within one subject field--a placement test.
(d) to probe for strengths and weaknesses in the development of a skill--a diagnostic test.
(e) to determine a student's present ability without regard to method of learning or specific courses--a proficiency test.

On the basis of steps one and two (i.e., the "what" and "why"), step three is to determine what type of test form to use. At this stage decisions are needed about such matters as:

(a) how the material is to be presented; i.e., formally or informally.
(b) whether a separate answer sheet is to be used.

(c) the method of scoring.
(d) what item type best lends itself to the presentation of the material.

And there are many more details (such as whether to use typeset, mimeograph, ditto, etc., etc.), which must be decided. There is almost an infinite variety of item types ranging from free response through the semi-objective type to the wholly objective multiple-choice type which is so prevalent today. Probably as good a reference as possible to many of these is a nice thick file of tests. It is an excellent idea to accumulate such a file, not only of EFL tests but of other types as well. Although questions in French are not of much use in an English test, the way the questions are presented may be very applicable.

Another important consideration at this point is the length of the test. A short test is not likely to be very reliable; i.e., the scores will not be stable. As a general rule, the longer the test (that is, the more samples of behaviour it takes), the more reliable the scores. If important decisions, such as course grades or admittance to university programs, are to be made on the basis of test scores, then the test must be reliable.

Step four is to write the test. This is the most challenging part of the whole procedure in many ways, and crucial because the success of the test depends ultimately on the "goodness" of its items. Whatever item type is chosen, each question or problem should be written with care and with an attempt to make the material interesting and stimulating. In nearly all kinds of test development more items should be written than are needed for the final form.

Time does not permit a thorough discussion of item writing. However, since the objective multiple-choice type is used very frequently in EFL tests, and since there are several rather common pitfalls to be avoided, I think it may be quite helpful to illustrate some of these errors.

(a) Overlap.
This example is from an auditory comprehension test:
The student hears: "George was barely able to lift the load."
He reads: A. George couldn't lift the load.
B. George could lift the load.
C. George was unable to lift the load.
Choices A and C overlap completely. Since the item cannot have two right answers, the intelligent student can select the right answer without understanding what was said.

(b) Answer choices should be reasonable, and extraneous choices should not be introduced to fill out the required number of choices.
1) From a reading comprehension test, following a passage about raising sheep in Australia:
"Wool-bearing animals have been raised in Australia ________."
A. only recently
B. for a long time
C. never

Choice C is so obviously wrong that everyone must eliminate it immediately, which reduces the number of possible choices to two.

2) From a structure test:

"Mary _____________ home last night."

A. walked C. walking

B. walks D. running

E. runs

In this case a decision must have been made to use five-choice items but when the writer came to this problem, he just didn't have enough usable forms of the verb "walk" and so introduced another verb to complete the item. With regard to meaning, the test taker has no reason to prefer "walk" over "run" and with regard to form, choice B overlaps with choice E as does C with D. The only possible answer logically is A, if the instructions call for only one right answer.

(c) Ambiguity.

From a structure test:

"The boys read this book, _________?"

A. don't they

B. didn't they

This is a blatant example, but it illustrates the kind of error that can creep into a test if items are not carefully reviewed. The test taker has no way of divining what tense the writer had in mind.

(d) All choices should fit.

From a vocabulary test:

"A ___________ person is not loyal."

A. tenacious C. superfluous

B. perfidious D. intolerant

A student who has learned the rules for the morphophonemic alternation of a/an will eliminate choice D so that his chances of choosing the correct choice by guessing are considerably improved.

These are some of the errors the writer should avoid and the reviewer should look for. By all means have a colleague review your material and ask him to be hypercritical.

From here on the process will vary markedly depending upon the nature of the test. In more formal tests, there will be large scale tryouts of the material followed by statistical analysis and selection of material for the final form. In less formal situations, the items will simply be selected and the test assembled. However, having come this far, don't discard the unused items, or the tests after they have been given. Build your own item file, and the next time around the whole process will be much simpler.

LISTENING AND READING

Virginia French Allen, Teachers College, Columbia University

You might like to predict what happened when students in a "high intermediate" ESL course were asked to read the following paragraph from a book intended for native speakers of English, and to write down what they thought the paragraph meant.

The paragraph reads as follows:

> I was ... born into the trying position of being the eldest of the family, so that the full force of my mother's theories about education were brought to bear upon me; and it fell to me to blaze a path to freedom for my juniors, through the forest of her good intentions [Gwen Raverat, Period Piece: A Cambridge Childhood (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1952).]

The passage had been chosen because it contained no technical or specialized vocabulary, and because it seemed to deal with a rather universal situation in human family life. Although it was syntactically far more difficult than any of the material used in the ESL course, it was no harder than most of the books these students were being asked to read in their subject-matter courses on campus, in Psychology and Philosophy. Having the students note down what they thought the author was saying seemed like a useful way of finding out how they were getting along in the world of communication outside the ESL program.

When the students were asked how they thought the writer of this paragraph felt about being the eldest in her family, their answers were not reassuring. It was revealed that half of these "high intermediate" students thought the author considered herself fortunate in having had the full benefit of her mother's education. Blessed with this advantage, they thought, the author had in later years been able to "light a candle in the wilderness" (as one of the more poetic members of the class phrased it) and to lead her own children to the freedom that results from good intentions. Undeterred by what the author had actually said, half the class had apparently reasoned that Mothers are good, Education is good, Good Intentions are good--and anyone who receives the full force of all this goodness must feel good about it! But why dwell further on the plight of students like these? We all know they are beset by problems at every turn whenever they try to comprehend what goes on in academic circles outside the ESL classroom.

How are we to prepare our students for irony in the books they read or in the lectures they hear? How can the ESL staff prepare students to deal with problems that await them in minor syntactic patterns like the postponed-subject construction in "It fell to me to...," problems of metaphor and idiom, and--above all--problems arising from lack of familiarity with the cultural context (both current and past) within which English-speaking writers and speakers operate?

What if a student's only contact with supervised ESL instruction is a part-time English course meeting two, three, or even five times a week? If he has only a few hours to spend under the direction of a trained ESL teacher, doubtless much of that time should be spent mainly on improving the student's own productive skills, his ability to speak and write. Yet something, somewhere, must be done to help him make sense out of what he reads and hears. Even if the student cannot be given "intensive" instruction, cannot be placed in a full-time ESL institute--and most foreign students on American campuses cannot devote full time to ESL study--somehow we must build into the student's program a whole set of experiences aimed explicitly at the development of receptive skills. Through these experiences the student must be exposed to English that is not "controlled" or made easy for him. But he must be exposed to this realistically difficult English in small doses. He needs to be inoculated with it, one might say. And he must be given a chance to figure out for himself, with the aid of a dictionary if necessary, and by repeatedly going over the same small piece of material, what the writer or speaker actually means

Clearly, on most campuses there is room for improvement in the use of electronic facilities for developing receptive skills. Why can't even the part-time ESL student be required to spend an hour or two each week in the lab--an hour or two distributed over five days in brief daily sessions--listening and responding to English that is as complex as the English he is expected to deal with in his non-ESL classes--but presented to him in bite-sized portions?

In many ESL programs the tape recorder is used almost exclusively for mim-mem exercises, replacement drills, and the manipulation of utterances that the machine puts into the student's mouth. This kind of activity has value; perhaps it is essential for helping the student learn to speak. But I am talking now about short, supervised listening sessions in which the student is not to imitate a model, and is not to engage in pattern practice. He is to listen with full attention to something that interests and challenges him; he is to get at the meaning of what he hears, and then produce a response that shows he has understood. The following suggested Listening Lab activities, which could take place in a room equipped with a single tape recorder if no lab is available, will illustrate the sort of material that could be recorded in the form of brief scripts, one to five minutes long.

1. Short-short stories: Often there are suitable one-page stories in the supplements to Sunday newspapers. There are some interesting possibilities in anthologies; e.g., the Williams and Wood collection, Short Stories As You Like Them (Harcourt Brace, 1940). The student listens to the story as often as he needs in order to answer two or three basic questions about the plot.

2. Short articles on semi-professional or general-interest subjects; e.g., the paragraph on American Indians in David P. Harris' Reading Improvement Exercises for Students of English as a Second Language (Prentice-Hall, 1966). Or, for beginners, the article on Pilgrims in Elizabeth Gillilan Mitchell's Beginning American English (Prentice-Hall, 1965). Or portions of Audrey Wright's Lets Learn English

(American Book Company, 1966, with recordings available). [Other promising sources include: Baumwoll, Dennis and Robert L. Saitz, Advanced Reading and Writing (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965); Danielson, Dorothy and Rebecca Hayden, Reading in English (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961); Doty, Gladys G. and Janet Ross, Language and Life in the U.S.A. (Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Co., 1960); Readers Digest Readings for English as a Second Language (Pleasantville, N. Y.: Readers Digest Services, 1964); Swain, Donna, et al, People, Places, and Opinions, (New York: American Book, 1963); National Council of Teachers of English, Our Changing World. English for Today, Book Four (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966); World Tapes (World Tapes for Education, Inc. P. O. Box 15703, Dallas, Texas).]

3. Lectures by campus professors (taped short portions, with a few easy questions, to acquaint the student with a whole new way of thinking, of presenting ideas).

4. Panel discussions (taped portions of these taken from radio programs or from campus meetings).

5. Short films, or scenes from longer ones (e.g., The Quiet One or Julien Bryan's Ohio Town or the 8mm sound films produced by Louis Forsdale at Teachers College. See Gerald Dykstra's "A New Dimension in Laboratories" in Harold Allen's Teaching English as a Second Language (McGraw-Hill, 1965).)

6. Expository passages suitable for selective listening for specific grammatical points, or intonation, or pronunciation points (e.g., the chapter by Eugene Nida in Harold Allen's Teaching English as a Second Language.) The student might listen just for the author's use of articles, then for his use of prepositions, etc.

7. One-act plays (e.g., two or three from P. Kozelka's collection of Fifteen American One Act Plays, (Washington Square Press, 1961).) Some of the dialog could be set up as "responsive reading" with fading props.

8. Dialect tapes to help develop "receptive versatility" (e.g., J. Donald Bowen on this point in Harold Allen's book cited under item 5 above). Try disc recordings of Our Changing Language by Evelyn Gott and Raven McDavid, Jr. (McGraw-Hill Book Co.)

9. Games that demand attentive listening to brief conversations (e.g., Allen & Allen, Listen and Guess (McGraw-Hill, 1964).) During each recorded five-minute conversation, the listeners play a guessing game.

10. Sentence-context tests like Clifford H. Prator's drills in his Manual of American English Pronunciation (Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1957).

11. Dialog-comprehension tests like the 1-minute conversations in the TOEFL examinations. Sample:

Woman: I wonder if Eleanor Lee is still working in the shoe factory.
Man: I thought I'd told you. She's a cashier in that new coffee shop, the one across from the bus station, her brother says. I was talking with him in the post office yesterday. He works there, you know.

Third Voice: Where is Eleanor Lee working now? Circle the right answer.

Student's Answer Sheet:
A. In a bus station.
B. In a coffee shop.
C. In a post office.
D. In a factory.

12. "Jackpot" quiz programs, radio style: Following the recorded questions and the "contestants" attempts at answers, the voice asks: "How much money would you have won if the M.C. had asked you the question you heard the contestants try to answer?"

13. "Advice" and "problem" programs, radio style: The voice says: "You've heard the man's problem. What advice would you give him? Then listen to the "expert" and see if you agree."

14. Poems and light verse (e.g., short repetition-filled items, in contemporary English. Some of it should be memorized after the listening session.)

15. Songs (Old Favorites; e.g., "Down by the Old Mill Stream" and even perhaps rock and roll). What word is repeated more than any other? What are the last 5 words of the song?

16. Simple arithmetic problems: The voice on the tape says: "Mr. Williams asked the post office clerk for a dollar's worth of 5-cent stamps. How many stamps did the clerk give him?"

17. Checking numbers: The voice says: "On your lab sheet, draw a circle around the number I say." The student's sheet looks like this:

A. 215 250
B. 395 935
C. 600 6000
D. 1500 150

18. Using an index: The voice says: "Open your copy of the World Almanac. Turn to the index. On what page can one find information about India?...About postal rates in the U.S.A.?...About imports and exports?...

19. Following directions: The voice says: "Open your lab book to page 23. What is the first word in the last paragraph on that page? The next-to-last word in the last paragraph?" etc.

20. Finding things on a road map. The voice says: "In which section of the map is the town of Millbrook? On which route is Leonia, New Jersey? Is Boston north or south of Chicago?"

21. Telegraphing messages: The voice says: "Put this information into a ten-word wire: 'Mr. Peters will be arriving at the Delhi airport Tuesday evening at ten on Qantas, Flight number 7.'"

22. "Cliff-Hangers": e.g., episodes from longer films, and from stories with suspenseful or dramatic plots. (These are useful in labs where students are to appear every day or 2 or 3 times a week and need to be motivated to attend regularly.) Try detective novels or stories of intrigue or suspense. A possible choice would be "The Headless Horseman" in Kenneth Croft's Reading and Word Study (Prentice-Hall, 1960).

A moment's thought could produce a number of equally promising additions to this list. The object is to give the listeners a real reason for trying to get at the meaning of what they hear. The listening session ought to be as varied and as entertaining as a "non-educational" radio program would be. The students ought to be made to want to visit the Listening Lab regularly, to match their wits against the machine, and to acquire ideas and information through attentive listening. Humor should often figure in the listening program, but of course not the "sick" sort of humor, or the kind that is based on verbal tricks.

Hours spent in the Listening Lab need not put a strain on the ESL program's instructional budget: someone with no ESL training at all can play the tapes, which could be recorded by any native speaker of English with a good voice. (Preferably, the recording process should be shared among a number of different speakers, including some from regions of the country distant from the student's local campus.) Naturally, someone on the ESL staff needs to keep an eye on the Listening Lab program, selecting material to be recorded and played, composing the comprehension questions, and supervising the checking of the responses (which ought to be of the most convenient, machine-scorable type). But an English-speaking student assistant with aptitude for this kind of work could soon be trained to keep the program running smoothly--as smoothly as any program involving machines can run.

The potential benefit to the foreign student will far outweigh the cost: not only will he develop skill in listening, but a guaranteed by-product will be improvement in reading, too. From each listening experience the student learns more about the boundaries between adjacent sectors of a sentence (boundaries signaled by the speaking voice but invisible to the reading eye when the sentence is printed on a page). [See Charles C. Fries, Linguistics and Reading (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962), p. 130, for explanations of the fact that "A large part of learning to read is a process of learning to supply rapidly and automatically the portions of the oral signals that are not represented in the graphic signs."]

If the listening student is sometimes permitted to follow a script with his eyes while the English-speaking voice reads it aloud, he has a chance to find out how the native speaker of the language groups together the words that belong together in a complicated sentence. And every time he listens, with comprehension, to a story or a play or a passage of expository prose, he learns more about the cultural context of English. He becomes a little more familiar with the network of customs and attitudes which English-speaking writers and their readers have grown up knowing.

I have stressed the need for special listening sessions outside the regular class period, between meetings of the class throughout the week. Some of what has been proposed here could profitably be substituted for some of the relatively aimless, uninspiring, and uninformative exercises that occasionally consume the class hour in some program; but even then, the merest fraction of what the students need can be given in class. No matter how well we teach, we can't take up the whole world of English discourse during our few class meetings; one can't take up an ocean with a spoon! But we can make better arrangements for the use of the student's out-of-class hours. We can give him frequent, brief, supervised, challenging encounters with "real" English in a "Listening" Lab.

GOALS FOR PRONUNCIATION: ACCEPTABLE PRODUCTION OR AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE PATTERNS?

Eloise Ensta, University of Illinois

My experience teaching English overseas covered the whole decade of the 1950's. Those were the years when Linguistics came into its own and was considered the "cure-all" for language learning problems. Linguists were dispatched to the field to give faltering programs a "shot in the arm" or to set up new "linguistically-oriented" programs. These assignments forced the linguists to look at real classroom problems and gave the classroom teacher a chance to evaluate so-called "linguistic methods." The exchange was sometimes stormy perhaps, but the mutual benefits were invaluable to our profession.

With the recent trend toward looking to other disciplines for help in solving language learning problems, I have felt encouraged to share with you some ideas from my earlier background of working with foreign students in a university speech clinic. My training in the field of Speech Correction and Speech Pathology has always colored my approach to language teaching, especially in the area of pronunciation. At the University of Illinois I have had an opportunity to experiment with various approaches while teaching the soon-to-be-published materials prepared by the late Helen B. Brennan and her colleague and successor, Dr. Katharine Aston. There are two basic tenets in speech correction which I believe are particularly applicable to pronunciation work in the teaching of English as a second language.

In working with articulation cases, the speech therapist always adheres to this cardinal rule: Be sure the student recognizes that he has an error which needs correcting. When we want to apply this rule to our foreign students we have a rather complex situation. Students come to us with some proficiency in English. With that proficiency they often bring numerous errors in stress, intonation, and the production of sounds. Helping them understand the nature of their problems appears to be a monumental task. It can be approached most successfully by starting our instruction with an overall view of the structure of the spoken language. After all, these students are mature, intelligent individuals. Even if their comprehension is somewhat limited we can, in the first three or four sessions, give them a general idea of the kinds of problems we intend to tackle and the way in which we will proceed. This definition of our goals is reassuring to students. Too often they despair of ever making any improvement in their pronunciation and they resent our insistence that they try. They are sure English is completely without pattern--a hopeless jumble. Linguistics has helped us, as teachers, to recognize the order in language. Shouldn't students be allowed to see that orderliness? Language is a fascinating subject. Why can't pronunciation work provide students with some insight into its workings? Reluctant learners who thought they were in for endless hours of tedious drill brighten at the prospect of being taught something about the structure of the language at the same time they are working to master small units of it. Through the analysis of a carefully selected initial dialogue they can get a general view of the areas we intend to cover, and they can do this while they are learning the dialogue for production.

Adult students enjoy being "let in" on the secrets of our trade. Too many teachers arm themselves with inventories of all the errors of all their students and plunge into the work of trying to eradicate those errors one by one. They expect their students to accept on faith the "I-know-what's good-for-you, now-do-it" approach. Students have a right to ask "Why?" and receive an organized answer. They also have a right to ask "How?" They should understand our philosophy of language teaching, realizing the theory that is behind our demands for certain kinds of activity.

Students are further reassured by learning that they have every right to be making the mistakes they make. When they recognize the differences between the structure of English and their own language they have a better idea of how they must modify their habits in order to communicate more effectively. A teacher seldom has time to work through a contrastive analysis with each of his students. He can, however, encourage each student to examine his own language in light of the structure of English and to note the points of contrast.

While presenting an overall view of the course content, we can introduce students to some of the vocabulary we may wish to use as well as to our system of symbolization for intonation, stress, and sounds. We cannot divorce one aspect of the language from the others and learn it in isolation. We have to use sounds and stress while we are teaching intonation. Therefore, it is helpful to be able to refer to these other areas in terms the students understand.

The initial overall view will necessarily be somewhat cursory. The students' real understanding of the basic intonation, stress, and sound patterns will have to come as the instruction proceeds. Much of this understanding can be attained through the process of discovery. In a controlled situation, students can often imitate patterns rather accurately. Thus, while they are producing the patterns in imitation of a model, students can be led to discover the nature of the pattern. They can learn to see one pattern in contrast to another that they have already learned, as in the falling and rising intonation of different kinds of questions (Are you going?--Where are you going?), the difference in stress in a noun compound and in an adjective noun phrase (the greenhouse--the green house) or the contrasting sounds used to form plurals (cats, dogs, and ostriches or hot dogs, potato chips, and oranges). The students are not merely asked to repeat a pattern over and over. They are encouraged to hear the pattern as the teacher gives the model and they themselves produce it, to visualize it as it is represented by useful symbols or gestures, and even to verbalize their understanding of it. Care must be taken not to spend too much time "intellectualizing" about what is being learned. None of us wants to regress to the days of teaching *about* the language rather than teaching the language itself. The discovery process can take place during group mim-mem of a sentence or dialogue illustrating a new pattern. Reinforcement of the concept can be built into the drill. Students can be taught to go right on repeating a pattern sentence while the instructor feeds him the "insight" clues. For example an intonation pattern can be dealt with as follows:

Instructor: That was an interesting lecture. (The instructure indicates the intonation pattern by pointing it out on a staff of four lines, or by drawing the intonation curve on the blackboard, illustrating the 2-3-1 pitch pattern.)
Students: That was an interesting lecture.
Instructor: That was an interesting lecture. (The instructor indicates the pattern by moving his hand in the air.)
Students: That was an interesting lecture.
Instructor: Da da da da da da DA da. (Again indicating the pattern in the air and being careful to keep the intonation pattern exactly like the key sentence.)
Students: That was an interesting lecture.
Instructor: Two two two two two two three one.
Students: That was an interesting lecture.
Instructor: That was an interesting lecture. (Pointing again to the blackboard.)
Students: That was an interesting lecture.

Students get used to this kind of "nonsense" and learn that it is a way of drawing attention to the more important patterns. A stress pattern may be developed in the following manner:

Instructor: She has a new dress. (Marking the symbols for secondary and primary stress over *new* *dress* in the sentence on the blackboard.)
Students: She has a new dress.
Instructor: She has a strong stronger. (Using appropriate hand signals to indicate secondary and primary stress.)

Students: She has a new dress.
Instructor: She has a secondary primary. (With the same hand signals.)
Students: She has a new dress.
Instructor: She has a(n) adjective noun.
Students: She has a new dress.
Instructor: She has a new dress. (With the same hand signals but drawing attention to the sentence on the blackboard.)
Students: She has a new dress.

This technique can even be used for sound drills:

Instructor: He needs a good cook book. (Underlining the /U/ words.)
Students: He needs a good cook book.
Instructor: He needs a good cook book. (Indicating the /U/ symbol with the hand.)
Students: He needs a good cook book.
Instructor: He needs a /U/ /U/ /U/.
Students: He needs a good cook book.
Instructor: He needs a good cook book. (Indicating the sentence on the blackboard.)
Students: He needs a good cook book.

Students enjoy this kind of reinforcement drill. They must continually apply the instructor's clues to what they are saying; they must think while they are producing. More important they really begin to understand the patterns they are practicing, to recognize those patterns when they hear them, to fit oral clues to what they read, and to construct sentences in the frame of the pattern.

I have recommended, then, that the student be made aware of his pronunciation problems. A student's recognition of his own errors is greatly facilitated if he is given specific guidance in the listening process. This leads us to a second basic tenet from speech correction, namely: the student should not be asked to produce a new sound, or a new oral pattern, until he has been given systematic ear training. Just what is "ear training"? Charles Van Riper, a speech pathologist, recommends four types of ear training for sounds [Speech Correction: Principles and Methods, 3rd ed. (Prentice-Hall, Inc.: New York, 1954), p. 224.] I will take some liberties with his definitions to make them cover stress and intonation patterns as well. Van Riper includes: (1) Isolation--training in detecting oral patterns or sounds as they occur in the stream of speech and recognizing them as entities; (2) Stimulation--training which gives the student concentrated exposure to a particular pattern or sound, (3) Identification--training in identifying the features of a pattern or sound which set it apart from others, and (4) Discrimination--training in comparing patterns or sounds, particularly the correct form in contrast to the error. Note the similarity between ear training and the "selective listening" Nida recommends to the language learner. [Learning a Foreign Language, Rev. ed. (Friendship Press: Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1957).] In ear training the teacher must motivate students to listen actively, forcing them to focus, or perhaps better stated, "to tune in" on, a designated pattern or sound. Ear training exercises must be carefully devised to direct attention to only one pattern or sound. They should be short, and they should be varied. The use of visual cues can make them more vivid; symbols on the blackboard or hand signals help relieve the strain of concentrated listening. I find the period of ear training with vowels an excellent time to introduce the basic spelling patterns for each sound. Students are always interested in writing, and they are relieved to find that there is *some* system in the spelling of English. The orthographic symbols help to identify the sound that is being drilled and give the student useful clues for the pronunciation of new words.

Ear training has been a tool in the speech therapist's kit for several decades. In their book *Voice and Articulation* Van Riper and Irwin examine the justification of its usefulness. [*Voice and Articulation* (Prentice-Hall, Inc.: Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1958) Chapter 6.] Their observations on the problem of monitoring one's own speech might be further investigated by our colleagues in allied fields. Van Riper and Irwin draw an analogy between self-monitoring and the automatic control mechanisms so common in our society, pointing out that each uses the functions of scanning, comparing with a standard, and correcting. They maintain that, during the years of speech acquisition, a person uses the auditory feedback of his own speech production as the primary means of judging accuracy but that as the speech patterns become stable, self-hearing plays a less important role, and kinesthetic and tactual clues take over the primary role in scanning feedback. They point out that an adult knows whether he has said "tame" or "came" even if environmental noise keeps him from hearing himself, that the feelings of the movement of the tongue and the contact it makes in the mouth identify the /t/ and /k/.

These men feel that ear training exercises can serve to rejuvenate or re-open the self-hearing circuit, so to speak. They recommend that the student be encouraged to take an interest in the pronunciation of others first of all, and then gradually learn to use listening to monitor their own speech. This recommendation lends itself nicely to the classrrom situation. Foreign students are naturally interested in one another. They enjoy being concerned with another person's problems and they "sharpen" their ears as they listen for someone else's substitutions, omissions, and distortions of sounds, or faulty stress or intonation patterns. These they contrast with the model of correct pronunciation. Students can also become aware of other students' reactions to their own efforts, and they may accept the criticism of a classmate more readily than that of the teacher. This allows the teacher to spend more of his time producing the positive clues and reinforcements. Of course, the students should be encouraged to attend to the pronunciation of native speakers whenever and wherever possible.

Good ear training means the student will be much readier for production. It also means there is a better chance for good results when using the most natural method of eliciting the target pattern or sound--the stimulation-imitation method. The student has no doubt about what pattern or sound is wanted, and he is more liable to be a good judge of the accuracy of his own performance. As his production of a pattern or sound becomes stable, it becomes possible to help him re-inforce not only the self-hearing of his correct production, but also the kinesthetic and tactual clues involved. All aspects of the error must be replaced and reinforced. The new pattern or sound must not only sound right but it must feel right before it can be comfortably assimilated into the student's automatic speech.

The task of helping students improve their pronunciation is a difficult and complex one. We must continually be looking for new approaches and techniques. We must discipline ourselves to make the most of each class hour, directing our efforts to the acquisition of those skills that will do the most for improved communication. In my opinion we serve our students best is we give them not only better control of spoken English, but also an understanding of thesystem of the language. When we teach grammar we structure the presentation and we limit the number of lexical items. We tell the student that he must learn the patterns, that he can spend the rest of his life acquiring vocabulary to use in those patterns. Our approach to pronunciation should be similar. We should make the student so aware of the basic patterns of spoken English and so descriminating in his listening that he can spend the rest of his life hearing new items, relating them to the proper patterns of intonation, stress, sound and spelling, and making them a part of his English.

CONTROLLING COMPOSITION: SOME PRACTICAL CLASSROOM TECHNIQUES

William R. Slager, University of Utah

Let me begin by defining composition as writing beyond the sentence level. This will enable me to dispose of the very necessary first steps of copying and writing down English from dictation, of becoming accustomed to the physical act of writing English. It will also enable me to pass over the important exercises in sentence building that inevitably precede composition. I would like to concentrate, then, on the writing of paragraphs and of themes of several paragraphs in lengths.

The assumption, by now basic to the profession, is that composing--writing beyond the sentence--must be guided or controlled. But unfortunately we have not until recently been very specific about ways in which control can be accomplished. What I intend to do here, therefore, is sketch some of the techniques that have been developed for guiding the students carefully so that they will leave the composition classroom with a feeling of achievement rather than frustration.

This sense of achievement is the goal toward which all composition teachers work. When we receive a set of compositions that must be covered with red marks--when we must spend hours correcting a single assignment--then we can be certain that we have not been teaching the students but merely punishing them. We have asked them to do something they are not yet ready to do, or we have given a vague assignment. The best procedure in these cases is to throw away the papers and begin again, to go to class with a detailed assignment that the conscientious students can follow with reasonable expectations of success.

Another comment is necessary by way of introduction. Beginning students need to start an assignment with more than an empty paper, a sharpened pencil, and a dictionary. They must have a subject about which all of them can write, a subject in common, so that they can begin with a repertory of relevant words and sentences. Since this common subject is usually provided by way of readings, the use of readings is assumed as background to most of the writing assignments described in this paper.

Now for the assignments themselves. The list is by no means complete, but I have tried to give examples that range from strict control to "freer" writing, and from the single paragraph to the whole composition. These ideas have been gathered from a number of texts, which I acknowledge. They also come from experience in our classrooms in Utah.

1) Answering questions, or turning questions into statements. In this kind of exercise, possibly the simplest introduction to paragraph writing, the students are given three or four sequential questions, which, when answered, form a coherent paragraph. Three examples follow, two of which are from Book V of the *English for Today* series [McGraw-Hill: New York, 1967], while the third is adapted from Lois Robinson's article on composition in Harold Allen's anthology, *Teaching English as a Second Language*. [See also *Guided Writing: A Sub-Freshman Composition Text for English as a Second Language* (Harper and Row: New York, 1967).]

Two kinds of questions can be used here--*yes-no* questions and *or* questions. In a sense, the exercise on *yes-no* questions is very artificial, since the students are asked to do no more than a mechanical operation. *Or* questions are more "natural" since they require the students to decide on the correct answer. If they are to make this decision, the questions must be based on a reading with which the students are familiar. Otherwise, the questions must be carefully phrased to rely on the students' general knowledge.

a) *Yes-no* questions. Turn the following *yes-no* questions into statements:

Are movies just a little over fifty years old? Have they grown to be the most popular form of entertainment in the world? Have people who have never seen a stage play seen movies? Have people who have never attended an opera or a concert seen movies?

b) *Or* questions. Answer the following *or* questions: (Based on a reading.)

Were the early movies skillful or crude? Was the photography poor or good? Did the people in the film move naturally and smoothly, or did they move in a fast and jerky way? Were the pictures steady, or did they flicker?

c) Or questions. Answer the following or questions. (Based on general knowledge.)

Is the Atlantic Ocean east or west of the United States? Is the Pacific Ocean east or west of the United States? Is Mexico north or south of the United States? Is Canada north or south of the United States?

One slight variation on these exercises is useful in showing the students ways to strengthen paragraph coherence by the use of connectors:

d) Refer to the paragraph under a) above. Combine the first two statements by using a though clause; the last two by using and.

e) Refer to the paragraph under b) above. Combine the last three statements by considering them as three items in a series. The first two can be connected by a comma, the second and third by a comma + and.

2) Reordering sentences. Baumwoll and Saitz, in Advanced Reading and Writing [Holt, Rinehart and Winston: New York, 1965], make extensive use of this kind of exercise, which involves the scrambling of the sentences of a carefully constructed paragraph. The students' job is to write the sentences out in correct order. In this way they become keenly aware of the sequence required of the sentences in a well-written paragraph. The problem for the teacher, of course, is to choose paragraphs where the order is clear and the sequence is obvious. Here is one example from Book V of English for Today.

a) Write out the sentences in the order they would appear in a paragraph.

1. The reason Hollywood was a natural place for making movies was that the sun shines there every day.
2. A suburb of Los Angeles, California, named Hollywood, started to become the center of the film industry.
3. In the early years, most movies were made outdoors with natural light.

3) Filling in blanks with connecting words and phrases. Exercises of this kind teach the students the grammatical connectors that are used to show relationships of ideas in a paragraph or a larger composition--for example, subordinating conjunctions such as although and conjunctive adverbs such as nevertheless. Many texts have lists of these words, but to my knowledge the teaching of connectors has not been developed in any systematic way. I refer here to their incorporation in meaningful exercises. A few representative examples follow, which come from Book V of English for Today. The idea is suggested in Miss Robinson's article and elsewhere.

a) A random list of connecting words. Fill in the blanks by choosing the appropriate connecting words: though, whom, but, what.

Shakespeare's art is English, _______ it is also international. _______ his characters act out upon the stage are universal human problems. Hamlet, Macbeth, and many other characters from his plays are timeless creations, in _______ people everywhere recognize themselves. _______ they may speak English, Shakespeare's characters can be understood in any language.

b) Contrasting important connecting words in contexts that establish their meaning.

Consequently means something like "as a result of this." Furthermore means something like "in addition to this." Decide what the relationship should be between the two sentences and then supply the connector that establishes that relationship:

Americans today are marrying at an earlier age than their parents and grandparents did; ______, they are required to assume heavy responsibilities when they are still very young. Many college students are holding down all-day jobs; ______, they are helping their wives at night and on weekends in the care of the children. Young men must assume responsibility early; ______, there is no longer much chance for "youthful pranks" or youthful experimentation.

c) A variation of this exercise is often useful. It requires the students to supply connectors, but does not tell them precisely where the connectors are to go.

Make the following paragraph read more smoothly by connecting two of the sentences with but and two of the sentences with so. Decide what the relationship between the sentences should be; then supply the conjunction that best expresses this connection:

I have always wanted to see a skyscraper. I never had the opportunity to visit a big city like New York or Chicago. I probably won't have the opportunity to visit the United States for a long time. I suppose the next best thing is to go to the library and find out if it has any books about skyscrapers.

d) Another variation suggests certain sentence types that can be used in a connected paragraph. The following exercise is a modification of an idea by Lois Robinson:

Write a paragraph with the title "A Skyscraper I read About." Begin sentences 1, 3, and 5 with There is/are. Begin sentences 2, 4, and 6 with It/They are:

1. skyscraper on 42nd Street
2. one hundred stories tall
3. fountain at the entrance
4. made of marble
5. twelve elevators in the lobby
6. very busy all day long

4) Supplying a topic sentence that limits the verb form or the sentence pattern. The following four examples are adapted from sentence-building exercises in Ross and Doty, Writing English: A Composition Text in English as a Foreign Language [Harper and Row: New York, 1965]. I have changed them slightly by adding a topic sentence so that the result is a simple paragraph rather than a series of sentences:

a) Simple present tense. My friend (Jim) spends his money cautiously. Add three sentences with the s form of the verb.

b) Present perfect construction. My friend (Tom) has tried to save money ever since he decided to go to college. Add three sentences beginning with He has....

c) Modal perfect construction. I don't know how (Jane) saved her money. Add three sentences beginning with She might have....

d) Object complement pattern. Yesterday we had a meeting of our club. Add three sentences of this type: We (elected) (Tom) (president). Choose from the following list of verbs and nouns:

Verbs: choose, name, call, make, consider
Nouns: chairman, treasurer, secretary

5) Finishing sentences that are carefully ordered to produce a coherent paragraph. The following examples are adapted from Book V of English for Today.

a) Add main clauses containing the modal might:

A TRIP TO NEW YORK

If I had enough money, I might take a trip to New York. If I went to New York.... If I passed a skyscraper.... If I went to the 100th floor.... If the elevator broke down....

b) Add main clauses with would:

If I were an English teacher.....If I were teaching pronunciation....If I were teaching grammar.....If I were teaching vocabulary.....If I were asked to explain the difference between British and American English.....

6) Writing summaries of paragraphs. Such summaries can be handled in a variety of ways. It is important to emphasize here that beginning and

intermediate students should not be inhibited by undue emphasis on paraphrasing. Rather, they should be encouraged to stay close to the reading itself in phrasing and development, using their own sentences whenever it seems necessary for them to shorten or to make clearer connections.

Providing a topic sentence, by the way, is frequently essential with the beginning composition student. A sentence like the one in the assignment below suggests the development that is to follow--a listing of the ways in which the talkies differ from the silent movies.

a) A modified dictation exercise. After the paragraph has been introduced orally, after the teacher has explained the vocabulary and the grammar, and after the students have become familiar with the content by means of intensive questioning and other kinds of discussion, an assignment like the following can be used successfully:

I am going to read paragraph one aloud three more times. Then see if you can summarize it. You are free to use as much of the original wording as you can remember. Begin your summary with the following topic sentence: The talkies were very different from the silent movies.

b) Writing one-sentence summaries.

Notice that the subject of the first paragraph could be summarized in a single sentence. Give similar one-sentence summaries of the other paragraphs: (The assignments are adapted from Book V of English for Today.)

Paragraph 1. Jazz had its beginnings in the folksongs of the Southern Negro.
Paragraph 2. Band instruments extended the human voice, thus opening the way to jazz.
Paragraph 3. ______________________________

7) Supplying the topic sentences for a composition larger than one paragraph. (Adapted from Book V of English for Today.)

a) Add three more sentences that develop the topic sentence:

1. Once I visited a village which was located....
____
____
____

2. The people of the village had their own distinct customs.
____
____
____

3. The people of the village spoke a distinctive dialect.
(a different word)
(a different pronunciation)
(a different grammatical construction)

4. The people of the village made their living by....

____

____

____

8) Writing summaries of whole compositions. The student who is learning about organization for the first time must see it on two levels. On the paragraph level, he looks for a topic sentence that summarizes the content of the paragraph--or he learns to supply one if the topic sentence is implied rather than stated. On the level of the whole composition, he looks for the central thought, which again may be stated or implied. Thus he gradually develops an awareness of organization by being led from the paragraph and its topic sentence to the larger composition with it central thought. At first it is best to give the students the central thought and ask them to add a sentence that shows the development of the reading. (Adapted from Book V of English for Today.)

a) Developing the central thought. The central thought of the reading can be stated as follows:

From their crude beginnings, motion pictures have developed into an art that is the most widespread form of entertainment in the world.

List the ways in which movies have developed from their crude beginnings. Use complete sentences, and follow the time order of the readings.

b) Calling attention to certain kinds of organization. In a sense, this is a kind of modified outline that requires the students to work out--with very specific guidance--the development of the essay.

In paragraphs one and two, the author calls attention to the increase in the number of automobiles (the cause) and says that this increase has brought about a change in living habits (the effect). In the rest of the reading he discusses the effects in detail. One effect (paragraph three) is the development of the motorized suburb. List in complete sentences the other effects that the automobile has had on American life.

(moving businesses)______________________________
(parking problems)______________________________
(American farmers)______________________________

c) If the goal is composition, such careful attention to organization can be justified only when it is applied to the students' own writing. Here are three assignments that ask for exactly the same kind of organization.

Write a composition of three or four paragraphs with a cause and effect organization. Choose one of the following topics:

1. The Effect of the (Telephone) on Our Family
2. The Effect of (the New Highway) on Our City
3. The Effect of the (Radio) on Our Country

9) *Deriving a composition from a model.* Elsewhere [*The Florida FL Reporter*, Spring, 1965] I have listed the characteristics of models that can be used successfully for this purpose: They must be short (not too much longer than the compositions the students will eventually be expected to write); they must be contemporary and reasonably simple (not too far beyond the style the students themselves should be expected to reach); and they should have an organization that is careful and obvious.

The following assignment is based on the first reading in Book III of the *English for Today* series [McGraw-Hill: New York, 1964]. Called "In a Small Town," it is a short sketch of the daily routine in Fairfield, a typical small town in the Middle West. The time sequence is obvious (from morning to night on weekdays, etc.), and the paragraphs often begin with time expressions (*It's early morning*...*At eight o'clock*... *At three thirty* ....) The assignment is made after the students are thoroughly acquainted with the reading. At this intermediate stage of language learning such acquaintance assumes an oral introduction, intensive questioning, dictation, etc.

a) Write a composition on life in a small town in your own country. Begin by making changes within the sentences: For example, *It's early morning in Fairfield* becomes *It's early morning in (Pana)*. Your teacher will help you to supply new words when you need them.

Decide what examples you want to use. For instance, in Fairfield, people are awakened when the newsboy throws the paper at the front doors. How are people awakened in the small town you want to describe? By bells? By whistles? By the noises of the tradesmen?

The composition that results from this assignment is often very close to the model, although the more advanced and creative students might depart quite far from it. In no event will the composition be in the strictest sense original. The students are still depending on the teacher and the model while they are beginning to express their own ideas in compositions longer than a single paragraph.

10) *Motivating a composition by showing pictures and supplying patterns of modification.* The following assignment is adapted from a much more detailed one presented by Adelaida Paterno in "A Lesson on English Modification," originally published in the *Manila Secondary Teachers' Quarterly* and reprinted in Harold Allen's anthology. The composition follows an elaborately developed lesson that reviews modifiers.

a) Here are some pictures of La Mesa Dam. What objects do you see in the pictures? How can you describe the objects?

(The teacher writes both nouns and the modification structures on the board: for example, fields, green fields, fields along the highway, fields that were yellow with ripening grain.

b) You went on an excursion to La Mesa Dam. Write a three-paragraph composition on your excursion.

Paragraph 1. You went on an excursion. What did you see?
Paragraph 2. When you arrived at your destination, what did you do?
Paragraph 3. How did you feel at the end of the day?

In the assignments as given by Miss Paterno, topic sentences are provided, and the students are also given key words and phrases in the sentences that are to be developed.

Students who can do all these exercises accurately are still a long way from free composition, which implies the ability to develop a well-organized theme on any subject that might be assigned. I have a suspicion that this kind of activity is never completely successful in the classroom. It requires a situation all too rare in our crowded schools today--frequent individual conferences of the highly motivated writer and the skillful teacher-editor.

A CONTRASTIVE-RHETORIC APPROACH TO READING AND WRITING

Robert B. Kaplan, University of Southern California

In 1933, Bloomfield stated that "Each sentence is an independent linguistic form, not included by virtue of any grammatical construction in any larger linguistic form." His pronouncement appears to have acquired the weight of divine law. Recent analysis in some aboriginal languages has made it obvious that not all sentences are independent, but that in fact there are grammatical constructions which indicate that some sentences are dependent and therefore are to be included in some larger linguistic form such as a paragraph.

In fact, Bloomfield did mention the completive sentence type, which he says, "consists of a form which merely supplements a situation--that is, an earlier speech, or gesture, or the mere presence of an object...." More recently, in an article entitled "Independent and Dependent Sentences" which appeared in the International Journal of American Linguistics [vol. XXIX, 1963], Viola Waterhouse describes in detail the distinction between dependent and independent sentence structures in English as well as in three aboriginal languages. In her conclusions, she offers "The concept of dependency on the sentence level...as a possible means for reaching analyses of levels higher than the sentence." It is with such levels that this paper will concern itself.

The teaching of reading and composition to foreign students does differ from the teaching of reading and composition to American students, and cultural differences in the nature of rhetoric supply the key to the difference in teaching approach. As Robert T. Oliver says, in the "Foreword" to Philosophy, Rhetoric and Argumentation,

> ...Rhetoric is a mode of thinking or a mode of "finding all available means" for the achievement of a designated end. Accordingly, rhetoric concerns itself basically with what goes on in the mind....rather than with what comes out of the mouth....Rhetoric is concerned with factors of analysis, data gathering, interpretation, and synthesis....What we notice in the environment and how we notice it are both predetermined to a significant degree by how we are prepared to notice this particular type of object....Cultural anthropologists point out that given acts and objects appear vastly different in different cultures, depending on the values attached to them. Psychologists investigating perception are increasingly insistent that what is perceived depends upon the observer's perceptual frame of reference. [ed. Maurice Nathanson and Henry W. Johnstone, Jr. (The Pennsylvania State University Press: University Park, Pennsylvania, 1965), pp. x-xi.]

Language teachers, particularly teachers of English as a second language, are late-comers in the area of international education. It has long been known among sociologists and anthropologists that logic per-se, as well as language, is a cultural phenomenon. Mikel Dufrenne says,

> Even if we take into account the lexical and grammatical similarities that exist between languages proceeding from a common hypothetical ancestor, the fact remains that the verbal universe is divided into multiple sectors. Sapir, Whorf, and many others, comparing the [American] Indian languages with the Occidental languages, have underlined this diversity very forcefully. It seems, indeed, as if the arbitrary character of language, having been shown to be of comparatively little significance at the level of the elements of a language, reasserts itself quite definitely at the level of the language taken as a whole. And if one admits that a language represents a kind of destiny, so far as human thought is concerned, this diversity of languages leads to a radical relativism. As Pierce said, if Aristotle had been Mexican, his logic would have been different; and perhaps, by the same token, the whole of our philosophy and our science would have been different.
> The fact is that this diversity affects not only the languages, but also the cultures, that is to say the whole system of institutions that are tied to the language..., [and] language in its turn is the effect and the expression of a certain world view that is manifested in the culture. If there is causality, it is a reciprocal causality.... The types of structures characteristic of a given culture would then, in each case, be particular modes of universal laws. They would define the Volksgeist.... [Language and Philosophy, tr. Henry B. Veatch (Indiana University Press: Bloomington, Indiana, 1963), pp.35-37.]

Logic, the basis of rhetoric, then, is evolved out of a culture; it is not universal. I am using *logic* not in its strict philosophical sense, but more loosely. Consequently, rhetoric is not universal either, but varies from culture to culture and even from time to time within a given culture. It is affected by canons of taste within a given culture at a given time. As Leo Spitzer says, in his essay "Language--The Basis of Science, Philosophy and Poetry,"

> Every language offers to its speakers a ready-made *interpretation* of the world, truly a *Weltanschauung*, a metaphysical word-picture which, after having originated in the thinking of our ancestors, tends to impose itself ever anew on posterity. Take for instance a simple sentence such as 'I see him....' This means that English and, I might say, Indo-European, presents the impressions made on our senses predominatly as human *activities*, brought about by our *will*. But the Eskimos in Greenland say not 'I see him' but 'he appears to me....' Thus the Indo-European speaker conceives as workings of his activities what the fatalistic Eskimo sees as events that happen to him. [*Studies in Intellectual History*, ed. George Boas *et al*. (The Johns Hopkins Press: Baltimore, 1953), pp. 83-84.]

The English language and its related thought patterns have evolved out of the Anglo-European cultural pattern. The expected sequence of thought in English is essentially a Platonic-Artistotelian sequence, descended from the philosophers of ancient Greece and shaped subsequently by Roman, Medieval European, and later Western thinkers. It is not a better nor a worse system than any other, but it is different. Michael Polanyi writes,

> ...As human beings, we must inevitably see the universe from a centre lying within ourselves and speak about it in terms of a human language by the exigencies of human intercourse. Any attempt rigourously to eliminate our human perspective from our picture of the world must lead to absurdity. [*Personal Knowledge: Toward a Post-Critical Philosophy* (University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1958).]

A fallacy of some repute and some duration is the one which assumes that because a student can write an adequate essay in his native language, he can necessarily write an adequate essay in a second language. That this assumption is fallacious has become more and more apparent as English-as-a-second-language courses have proliferated at American colleges and universities in recent years. Foreign students who have mastered syntactic structures have still demonstrated inability to compose adequate themes, term papers, theses, and dissertations. Instructors have written, on foreign student papers, such comments as: "The material is all here, but it seems somehow out of focus," or "Lacks organization," or "Lacks cohesion." And these comments are essentially accurate. The foreign-student's perception is out of focus because the foreign student is employing a rhetoric and a sequence of thought which violate the expectations of the native reader. In *Culture, Language, and Personality*, Sapir says,

> A personality is carved out by the whole subtle interaction of those systems of ideas which are characteristic of the culture as a whole, as well as of those systems of ideas which get established for the

> individual through more special types of participation. [(University of California Press: Los Angeles, 1964), p. 157.]

The fact that sequence of thought and grammar are related in a given language has already been demonstrated adequately by Paul Lorenzen [Logik and Grammatik (Mannheim, Germany, 1965)]. His brief paper proposes that certain linguistic structures are best comprehended as embodiments of logical structures. Beyond that, every rhetorician from Cicero to Brooks and Warren has indicated the relationship between thought sequence and rhetoric. Here, for example, is Brooks and Warren's explication of paragraphing in Modern Rhetoric [2nd ed. (Harcourt, Brace and Co.: New York, 1958), pp. 267-68.]

> A paragraph...is a division of the composition, set off by an indentation of its first sentence or by some other conventional device, such as extra space between paragraphs....Paragraph divisions signal to the reader that the material so set off constitutes a unit of thought.
>
> For the reader this marking off of the whole composition into segments is a convenience, though not a strict necessity....Since communication of one's thought is at best a difficult business, it is the part of common sense (not to mention good manners) to mark for the reader the divisions of one's thought and thus make the thought structure visible upon the page....
>
> Paragraphing, obviously, can be of help to the reader only if the indicated paragraphs are genuine units of thought....For a paragraph undertakes to discuss one topic or one aspect of a topic.

The thought patterns which speakers and readers of English appear to expect as an integral part of their communication is a sequence that is dominantly linear in its development. An English expository paragraph usually begins with a topic statement, and then, by a series of subdivisions of that topic statement, each supported by example and illustrations, proceeds to develop that central idea and relate that idea to all the other ideas in the whole essay, and to employ that idea in its proper relationship with other ideas, to prove something, or perhaps to argue something.

In their work entitled Rhetoric: Principles and Usage, Hughes and Duhamel state,

> A piece of writing may be considered unified when it contains nothing superfluous and it omits nothing essential to the achievement of its purpose....A work is considered coherent when the sequence of its parts...is controlled by some principle which is meaningful to the reader. Unity is the quality attributed to writing which has all its necessary and sufficient parts. Coherence is the quality attributed to the presentation of material in a sequence which is intelligible to its reader. [Prentice-Hall, Inc.: Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1962), pp. 19-20.]

Contrarily, the English paragraph may use just the reverse procedure; that is, it may state a whole series of examples and then relate those examples into a single statement at the end of the paragraph. These two types of development represent the common inductive and deductive reasoning which the English reader expects to be an integral part of any formal communication.

For example, the following paragraph written by Macaulay demonstrates a normal paragraph development:

> Whitehall, when [Charles the Second] dwelt there, was the focus of political intrigue and of fashionable gaiety. Half the jobbing and half the flirting of the metropolis went on under his roof. Whoever could make himself agreeable to the prince or could secure the good offices of his mistress might hope to rise in the world without rendering any service to the government, without even being known by sight to any minister of state. This courtier got a frigate and that a company, a third the pardon of a rich offender, a fourth a lease of crown-land on easy terms. If the king notified his pleasure that a briefless lawyer should be made a judge or that a libertine baronet should be made a peer, the gravest counsellors, after a little murmuring, submitted. Interest, therefore, drew a constant press of suitors to the gates of the palace, and those gates always stood wide. The King kept open house every day and all day long for the good society of London, the extreme Whigs only excepted. Hardly any gentleman had any difficulty in making his way to the royal presence. The levee was exactly what the word imports. Some men of quality came every morning to stand round their master, to chat with him while his wig was combed and his cravat tied, and to accompany him in his early walk through the Park. All persons who had been properly introduced might, without any special invitation, go to see him dine, sup, dance, and play at hazard and might have the pleasure of hearing him tell stories, which indeed, he told remarkably well, about his flight from Worcester and about the misery which he had endured when he was a state prisoner in the hands of the canting meddling preachers of Scotland. [From The History of England from the Accession of James the Second (London, 1849-61).]

The paragraph begins with a general statement of its content, and then carefully develops that statement by a long series of rather specific illustrations. While it is discursive, the paragraph is never digressive. There is nothing in this paragraph that does not belong here; nothing that does not contribute significantly to central idea. The flow of ideas occurs in a straight line from the opening sentence to the last sentence.

Without doing too much damage to other ways of thinking, perhaps it might be possible to contrast the English paragraph development with paragraph development in other linguistic systems.

For the purposes of the following brief analysis, some seven hundred foreign student compositions were carefully analyzed. Approximately one hundred of these were discarded from the study on the basis that they represent linguistic groups too small within the present sample to be significant. But approximately six hundred examples, representing three basic language groups, were examined. [For a more detailed analysis of the population see "Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education," Language

Learning (1966), vol. XVI, nos. 1 & 2, pp. 1-20.]

In the Arabic language, for example (and this generalization would be more or less true for all Semitic languages), paragraph development is based on a complex series of parallel constructions, both positive and negative. This kind of parallelism may most clearly be demonstrated in English by reference to the King James version of the Old Testament. Several types of parallelism typical of Semitic languages are apparent there because that book, of course, is a translation from an ancient Semitic language, a translation accomplished at a time when English was in a state of development suitable to the imitation of those forms.

1. Synonymous Parallelism: The balancing of the thought and phrasing of the first part of a statement or idea by the second part. In such cases, the two parts are often connected by a coordinating conjunction. Example: His descendants will be mightly in the land/ and / the generation of the upright will be blessed.

2. Synthetic Parallelism: The completion of the idea or thought of the first part in the second part. A conjunctive adverb is often stated or implied. Example: Because he inclined his ear to me/ therefore / I will call on him as long as I live.

3. Antithetic Parallelism: The idea stated in the first part is emphasized by the expression of a contrasting idea in the second part. The contrast is expressed not only in thought but often in phrasing as well. Example: For the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous:/ But the way of the wicked shall perish.

4. Climatic Parallelism: The idea of the passage is not completed until the very end of the passage. This form is similar to the modern periodic sentence in which the subject is postponed to the very end of the sentence. Example: Give unto the Lord, O ye sons of the mighty, / Give unto the Lord glory and strength. [I am indebted to Dr. Ben Siegel of California State Polytechnic College for this analysis.]

The type of parallel construction here illustrated in single sentences also forms the core of paragraphs in some Arabic writing. Obviously, such a development in a modern English paragraph would strike the modern English reader as archaic or awkward, and more importantly it would stand in the way of clear communication. It is important to note that in English, maturity of style is often gauged by degree of subordination rather than by coordination.

The following paper was written as a class exercise by an Arabic-speaking student in an advanced level English-as-a-second-language class at an American university:

> The contemporary Bedouins, who live in the deserts of Saudi Arabia, are the successors of the old bedouin tribes, the tribes that was fascinated with Mohammad's massage, and on their shoulders Islam built it's empire. I had lived among those contemporary Bedouins for a short period of time, and I have learned lots of things about them. I found out that they have retained most of their ancestor's

> characteristics, inspite of the hundreds of years that separate them. They are famous of many praiseworthy characteristics, but they are considered to be the symbol of generosity; bravery; and self-esteem. Like most of the wandering peoples, a stranger is an undesirable person among them. But, once they trust him as a friend, he will be most welcome. However, their trust is a hard thing to gain. And the heroism of many famous figures, who ventured in the Arabian deserts like T. E. Lawrence, is based on their ability to acquire this dear trust!
> Romance is an important part in their life. And "love" is an important subject in their verses and their tales.
> Nevertheless, they are criticized of many things. The worst of all is that they are extremists in all the ways of their lives. It is there extremism that changes sometimes their generosity into squandering, their bravery into brutality, and their self-esteem into haughtiness. But in any case, I have been, and will continue to be greatly interested in this old, fascinating group of people.

Disregarding for the moment the grammatical errors in this student composition, it becomes apparent that the characteristics of parallelism do occur. The next-to-last element in the first sentence, for example, is appositive to the preceding one, while the last element is an example of synonymous parallelism. The two clauses of the second sentence illustrates synonymous parallelism. In the second "paragraph" the first sentence contains both an example of antithetic parallelism and a list of parallel nouns. The next two sentences form an antithetic pair, and so on. It is perhaps not necessary to point out further examples in the selection. It is important, however, to observe that in the first sentence, for example, the grammatical complexity is caused by the attempt to achieve an intricate parallelism. While this extensive parallel construction is linguistically possible in Arabic, the English language lacks the necessary flexibility. Eight conjunctions and four sentence connectors are employed in a matter of only fourteen "sentences." In addition, there are five "lists" of units connected by commas and conjunctions.

Another paper, also written by an Arabic-speaking student under comparable circumstances, further demonstrates the same tendencies:

> At that time of the year I was not studying enough to pass my courses in school. And all the time I was asking my cousin to let me ride the bicycle, but he wouldn't let me. But after two weeks, noticing that I was so much interested in the bicycle, he promised me that if I pass my courses in school for that year he would give it to me as a present. So I began to study hard. And I studying eight hours a day instead of two.
> My cousin seeing me studying that much he was sure that I was going to succeed in school. So he decided to give me some lessons in riding the bicycle. After four or five weeks of teaching me and ten or twelve times hurting myself as I used to go out of balance, I finally knew how to ride it. And the finals in school came and I was very good prepared for them so I passed them. My cousin kept his promise and gave me the bicycle as a present. And till now I keep the bicycle in a safe place, and everytime I see it, it reminds me how it helped to pass my courses for that year.

In the first paragraph of this example, four of the five sentences, or 80% of the sentences, begin with a coordinating element. In the second paragraph, three of the six sentences, or 50% of the total, also begin with a coordinating element. In the whole passage, seven of the eleven sentences, or roughly 65%, conform to this pattern. In addition, the first paragraph contains one internal coordinator, and the second contains five internal coordinators; thus, the brief passage (210 words) contains a total of thirteen coordinators. Most of the ideas in the passage are coordinately linked; there is very little subordination, and the parallel units exemplify the types of parallelism already noted.

Some experimenters have pointed out, quite correctly, that the untrained or unsophisticated American student writes papers which are very much like this, and that perhaps the extensive parallelism is merely the effect of a lack of sophistication in the language. That is not so. It would be simple to demonstrate that native speakers of Oriental languages, for example, do not construct paragraphs containing such elaborate parallelisms. Furthermore, contrastive examination of papers by unsophisticated American students indicate that, while they do employ much greater numbers of parallel constructions, their constructions appear to be dominantly of the synonymous type, and occasionally of the climatic type, but rarely of the synthetic or antithetic types. Native speakers of Arabic, on the other hand, construct dominantly synthetic and antithetic parallel units.

There are, of course, other examples that might be discussed as well, but these paragraphs may suffice to show that each language and each culture may have a paragraph order unique to itself, and that part of the learning of a particular language involves the mastering of its logical system.

> ...One should join to any logic of the language a phenomenology of the spoken word. Moreover, this phenomenology will, in its turn, rediscover the idea of a logos immanent in the language; but it will seek the justification for this in a more general philosophy of the relations between man and the world....From one culture to another it is possible to establish communication. The Rorschach test has been successfully applied to the natives of the island of Alor. [Dufrenne, pp. 39-40.]

This discussion is intended only to demonstrate that paragraph developments other than those normally regarded as desirable in English do exist. In the teaching of paragraph structure to foreign students, whether in terms of reading or in terms of composition, the teacher himself must be aware of these differences, and he must make these differences overtly apparent to his students. In short, contrastive rhetoric must be taught in the same sense that contrastive grammar is presently taught. Not much has been done in the area of contrastive rhetoric. It is first necessary to arrive at accurate descriptions of existing paragraph orders other than those common to English. Furthermore, it is necessary to understand that these categories are in no sense meant to be mutually exclusive. Patterns may be derived for typical English paragraphs, but paragraphs like those described above as being atypical in English do exist in English. By way of obvious example, Ezra Pound writes paragraphs which are circular in their structure, and William

Faulkner writes paragraphs which are wildly digressive. The paragraph being discussed here is not the "literary" paragraph, however, but the expository paragraph. The necessities of art impose structures on any language, while the requirements of communication can often be best solved by relatively close adhesion to established patterns.

In the teaching of English as a second language, what does one do with the student who is reasonably proficient in the use of syntactic structure but who needs to learn to write themes, theses, essay examinations, and dissertations? The "advanced" student has long constituted a problem for teachers of English as a second language. The contrastive analysis of rhetoric is offered as one possible answer to the existing need. Such an approach has the advantage that it may help the foreign student to form standards of judgment consistent with the demands made upon him by the educational system of which he has become a part. At the same time, by accounting for the cultural aspects of logic which underlie the rhetorical structure, this approach may bring the student not only to an understanding of contrastive grammar and a new vocabulary, which are parts of any reading task, but also to a grasp of idea and structure in units larger than the sentence. A sentence, after all, rarely exists outside a context. Applied linguistics teaches the student to deal with the sentence, but it is necessary to bring the student beyond that to a comprehension of the whole context. He can only understand the whole context if he recognizes the logic on which that context is based. The foreign student who has mastered the syntax of English may still write a bad paragraph or a bad paper unless he also masters the logic of English. The understanding of paragraph patterns can allow the student to relate syntactic elements within a paragraph and perhaps even to relate paragraphs within a total context.

Finally, it is necessary to recognize the fact that a paragraph is an artificial thought unit employed in the written language to suggest a cohesion which commonly may not exist in oral language. As an artificial unit of thought, it lends itself to patterning quite readily. In fact, since it is imposed from without, and since it is a frame for the structuring of thought into logical patterns, it is by its very nature patterned. The rhetorical structures of English paragraphs may be found in any good composition text. The patterns of paragraphs in other languages are not so well established, or perhaps only not so well known to speakers of English. These patterns need to be discovered, or uncovered, and compared with the patterns of English in order to arrive at a practical means for the teaching of such structures to non-native users of the language.

A SURVEY OF UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE AT THE INTERMEDIATE AND ADVANCED LEVELS

Robert P. Fox, University of Illinois

During the business luncheon of the 1965 NAFSA Conference in Philadelphia, it was suggested that the status of intermediate and advanced ESL programs be investigated and reported on at the 1966 conference. Miss Katharine O. Asten, the ATESL Program Chairman, also received correspondence urging that something be done in this area. A committee composed of Katharine O. Asten, Robert P. Fox, Richard E. Spencer, and Mary A. Hussey (Chairman), all of the University of Illinois, Urbana, was appointed to conduct a survey of intermediate and advanced programs at the university and college level.

In February 1966 a thirty-two page questionnaire was mailed to some four hundred universities and colleges in the United States. Since the committee was well aware of the length of the questionnaire and the detailed nature of much of the information requested a cover letter from Kenneth Croft, Chairman of ATESL, was attached requesting that the prespective respondents leave blank any question not applicable to their institution or too difficult to answer without a great deal of research, but to please return the questionnaires to the committee--a partially completed questionnaire being better than no questionnaire at all.

The committee was also aware of the fact that many of the recipients of our survey had received TENES, a Survey of the Teaching of English to Non-English Speakers in the United States, and might feel that we were duplicating TENES. TENES, however, covered a much broader spectrum in that it was directed not only at college and university programs but elementary and secondary school programs at the beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels. The TENES survey was studied by the committee before making up the survey now being reported. There was little duplication, but where duplication did occur it was felt necessary because of the two year lapse between the two surveys. Our survey concentrated on intermediate and advanced programs at the college and university level only.

Expecting only a fifteen percent return because of the length of the questionnaire, we were pleasantly surprised by an approximately twenty-five percent return. Questionnaires were returned by institutions in thirty-three States giving us a cross section of the entire United States and allowing for some generalizations to be made about the status of intermediate and advanced ESL programs.

The committee would like to thank those institutions responding to the survey and at the same time urge those that have not yet returned the questionnaire to please do so, so that the information may be incorporated with the results thus far obtained and give greater validity to the survey.

The most general and perhaps the most significant question for us here is the question on the cover page of the questionnaire: How do you provide instruction in English to the foreign students who are enrolled in your institution? The answers indicated:

21 By separate courses for foreign students which satisfy the degree requirements in English.
39 By separate courses for foreign students which prepare the students for required English courses with American students (native speakers of English) later.
11 By separate foreign student sections of English courses regularly scheduled for American students.
11 By courses with American students which are concurrently supplemented with special instruction for foreign students.
  8 Extra class periods regularly scheduled for the foreign students.
  5 Regular tutorial sessions with the class instructor.
  2 Regular tutorial sessions with students employed for these services.
  ___ Regular tutorial sessions with community volunteers.
  1 Regular tutorial sessions with student volunteers.
  8 Conferences as needed with the class instructors.
  2 Supplementary laboratory assignments.
  5 Supplementary written assignments.
  4 Supplementary work in programmed texts.
  4 Supplementary reading assignments.
  2 Other.
19 By classes with American students with no provision for foreign students.
9 Other.

The length of the survey precludes my going into detail, but one of the most important parts is section I, "Definition of 'Advanced' Courses in ESL":

88. How would you define "advanced" course in English as a second language?

46 As a course for students with a high level of language proficiency.
5 As a course for students with advanced academic standing.
15 As a course to be taken with limited concurrent enrollment in other courses.
11 As a course to be taken with unlimited concurrent enrollment in other courses.
2 Other.

89. What do you think the content of an "advanced" course in English as a second language should include?

20 Drill on sentence patterns.
40 Development of controlled paragraph writing, augmented by drill sessions.
48 Development of larger units of discourse, augmented by drill sessions.

4 Developments of larger units only.
5 Other.

The next question concerned the number of hours of class instruction that should be devoted to an advanced course. Our statistical services unit changed this question slightly and came up with 452 class hours and 151 laboratory hours by adding all the answers together. The majority of the respondents, however, recommended 3 class hours per week with 2 hours of laboratory work.

The final question in this section was:

91. What is the purpose of the "advanced" course in ESL?

14 To complete the English requirements for graduation.
31 To prepare the student for enrollment in English classes with native speakers.
36 To meet his language needs for study in his major field.
35 To meet his language needs in his co-curricular as well as his curricular activities.
1 Other.

Turning from the "definition" of advanced ESL courses, we should perhaps look at the types of courses given by the responding institutions. Question 18 of the survey asked for a description of the courses offered. A number of institutions submitted catalog descriptions for this question and carefully attached them to page 21 of the questionnaire. These descriptions were carefully removed before the questionnaires were sent to the statistical unit and have not reached me yet so I'll only be able to give you a very sketchy idea of what types of courses are being offered and the number of institutions offering them:

Grammar	Intermediate	30
	Advanced	39
Composition		29
Pronunciation		13
Reading		7
Literature		2
Conversation		3
Pattern Practice		1
Civilization		1

Since our time is short, I'll only give you the results of one more question. Question 27 was concerned with the commercial texts being used. In looking over the responses I realized that there were far too many different texts used to be able to give you a complete list of them now. I therefore made a list of what seemed to be the most common texts used and ended up with a list of 47 titles. Of these 47 texts the most popular is Lado and Fries English Sentence Patterns used by 12 institutions; next is Pattern Practice used by 9; Praninskas Rapid Review of English Grammar and Doty and Ross Writing English are both used by 8 institutions. The rest of the texts on the list are used by six or fewer institutions. There doesn't seem to be any most popular text, and this seems very fitting for a group as diversified as we are.

In closing I would once again like to thank, on behalf of the committee, our respondents and to assure you that we will get the final results of the survey to you as soon as possible.

THE ROLE OF THE NAFSA FIELD SERVICE PROGRAM IN STRENGTHENING THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Katherine C. Bang, Director, NAFSA Field Service Program

I am delighted to be here, but I am particularly delighted because I think that the role of the teacher of English as a second language, in the whole field of international education, is a crucial one. I am sure that you are aware of how crucial it is. I'm not sure how aware poeple across the country are, and I think that it's terribly important that we look together at some of the problems which we are beginning to find in institutions where English is being taught either not at all or in a rather casual and informal fashion, and to see what we can do about the situation.

I don 't know how many of you are familiar with the Field Service Program of NAFSA; but, at the risk of boring those who are, I am going to go very quickly over the reasons for its establishment, and the methods which it uses in promoting its purposes because you, as members of this section, are very much involved. It was as a result of a project which was presented to the Department of State by the NAFSA Board of Directors that the Field Service Program was established in 1963. The purpose of the grant was to assist colleges and universities in strengthening their programs for foreign students.

Eight major areas were listed as needing special attention: selection and admissions, English language proficiency, initial orientation, academic and personal advising, finances and employment, housing, interpretation of the United States to foreign students, and American-foreign student relationships. Actually, after the selection and admissions process, in my judgment, and that of many other people, the single most important area is that of English language proficiency because it affects all the rest. How we interpret the United States to foreign students, how the foreign student relates to his fellow students, how he succeeds academically all depend on his ability to communicate. Everything that he does depends upon his ability to make himself understood and to understand our society. This can't be achieved by observation alone. It can be achieved by being able to talk in the language of the country with the people of the country, being able to understand the lectures, being able to respond to the tests, being able to participate in a seminar. All of these things are absolutely vital. So I just want to remind you, to reassure you, that we are deeply concerned about English language proficiency and that we recognize thoroughly the tremendously important ròle which all of you are playing.

The major methods of the FSP are publications, workshops, consultations, and In-Service Training grants. We have been preparing, publishing, and distributing Guidelines on the eight areas which I have just mentioned, and one of these Guidelines is called "English Language Proficiency." It was prepared on the basis of a rough draft by Dr. Jayne Harder, edited by our editorial consultant, and further revised by a group of experienced teachers of English as a second language. We think that the final product is a pretty good one; not the last word, but a very good beginning. It was designed, of course, primarily for those institutions which have not already started to think about how one teaches English as a second language. But it has many suggestions which will be useful to those in a more advanced stage. Free copies have been sent to every Foreign Student Adviser at every institution in the United States at which foreign students are enrolled. If you haven't seen a copy, ask your Foreign Student Adviser to show you his, or send to our Central Office in Washington for a copy.

We have also briefed a group of members of ATESL to prepare them to go out as consultants on request to institutions interested in strengthening their programs in English as a second language. We have had, up until this moment, 28 requests for this kind of service--28 out of 214 requests which have come into our office in Cleveland since last August when this service was first initiated. The balance of the consultation requests have been for generalists, to review total programs for foreign students, or for consultants in Selection and Admissions. We've sent people to well-established institutions, and we've sent them to institutions just beginning. So the service is available across the board to any institution wishing it, without any cost to the institution.

Another method which we use is that of the In-Service Training Grant, under which a person in the field, a Foreign Student Adviser, a teacher of English, or an Admissions person, wishing to consult with his colleagues and to observe other programs, requests from the NAFSA Field Service Program a grant which enables him to make such visits. He is paid per diem and travel. The application for the grant has to be supported by a letter from his immediate superior and from the President of the institution or the Director of an Institute. I regret to tell you that up to this date we've had only three In-Service Training grants requested in ATESL, although I've had a number of other requests which have been given to me during this Conference. We hope many more of you will want to take advantage of the opportunity to see what is being done elsewhere.

In an effort to publicize all of these services as widely as possible, we have engaged a number of promotional efforts. We've sent information to the 800 TESL's listed in the NAFSA Directory, regardless of their membership in ATESL. To date, we've had 57 requests for information generally, and 13 requests for information about In-Service Training grants. We also sent 115 letters to a special list sent us by the National Council of Teachers of English, at Kenneth Croft's suggestion. We've had six requests for information from this group, and four requests for information about grants. Obviously, the response to these mailings has not been overwhelming. The reason that I am calling this matter to your attention is that we would like to reach many more persons who are working on staffs, persons who have competence in the field, but who may not be aware of the service which is available, regardless of membership in NAFSA or ATESL.

I would like to conclude by mentioning a pilot project which has been tried in Region IV by Wallace Ewing, one of your members, who prepared a proposal for the Field Service Program in which we were tremendously interested. We gave him a grant which has made it possible for him to make informal visits to institutions in Region IV in five states. He selected ones with which we have had no contact whatsoever in order to determine the status of teaching English as a second language. Through these visits, he has confirmed his suspicion that the expertise in this field is not as extensive as we would like. In fact, most students are being taught in classes in English or English composition designed for American students rather than in special classes of English as a second language.

In a preliminary report, he observes that five out of seven institutions which he visited in the first stage of his visits had people teaching English as a second language who were in the field by accident and had no training for it whatsoever! He found that five out of seven institutions were not satisfied with their present program. At least that's a first step towards eventual improvement. And finally, he discovered that five out of seven were only vaguely familiar with NAFSA, and that six out of seven had never heard of ATESL. It seems to me that although this has been only a very small sample from which it would be dangerous to generalize, it does indicate the tremendous job which NAFSA, through ATESL, faces.

We have also sponsored several workshops in English as a second language, particularly in the North West part of the country. One of these workshops, for which Dr. Robert Kaplan was a resource person, attracted 60 people! I understand that two-thirds of the participants had never before been at a workshop of this sort.

Through the consultations, workshops, In-Service Training grants, and distribution of materials, the NAFSA Field Service Program can do a good deal to help you in raising the level of the teaching of English as a second language in institutions across the country. But we can't do it alone. We need you.

The NAFSA Field Service Program is planning for the coming year to work very closely with ATESL, and I've already been having an informal conversation with Dr. William Slager about some of the things which we hope will be done. I'm very hopeful that there will be some exciting developments in your field. Thus, when I'm asked to come back next year to your meeting in Houston (you see I've invited myself and I've accepted the invitation), I'll be able to give you a more hopeful report of what is happening in your field, which you and I both consider so essential.

ALPHABETICAL INDEX OF AUTHORS

ALLEN, Virginia French 67

BANG, Katherine C. 97

CARROLL, John B. 46

CATFORD, John C. 41

ENATA, Eloise 72

FERGUSON, Charles A. 35

FINOCCHIARO, Mary 1

FOX, Robert P. 94

GARDNER, Robert C. 51

KAPLAN, Robert B. 85

LADO, Robert v

McINTOSH, Lois 29

OHANNESSIAN, Serarpi 8

PALMER, Leslie A. 63

PRATOR, Clifford H. 58

SCHACHTER, Paul 18

SLAGER, William R. 77

VAN SYOC, W. Bryce 14

WILSON, Robert D. 24